26733

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* JULIUS EDWARD MICHAEL COHN

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* An Investigation of Curricular Innovation and Educational Knowledge Codes in a North American University

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* University of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/*GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M. ED.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* Prof. J.R. YOUNG.

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* 22/9/75 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ*

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXE* 57, Lache Lane, Chester, England

NL-91 (3-74)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN INVESTIGATION OF CURRICULAR INNOVATION AND EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE CODES IN A NORTH AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

by

ⓒ JULIUS EDWARD MICHAEL COHN

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION
IN
SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1975

© JULIUS EDWARD MICHAEL COHN 1976

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled An Investigation of Curricular Innovation and Educational Knowledge Codes in a North American University submitted by Julius Edward Michael Cohn in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Sociology of Education.

John Young
Supervisor

Arthur K. Davis

Harry Garfinkle

Date September 16, 1975

ABSTRACT

Dawe's distinction between sociological understandings founded on the priority of society as the necessary means of establishing order in the anarchical relations of men, and sociological understandings founded on the need for most men to regain control of the institutions of society; was used to critically examine Bernstein's theory of educational knowledge codes.

As a result of this examination it was suggested that Bernstein's two educational knowledge codes belonged to Dawe's first category of sociological understanding, and that a third code was necessary to take into account Dawe's second category of sociological understanding. This code was developed theoretically and termed the Emancipatory Code.

Using these three codes an empirical situation in a large Western Canadian University was examined, where a professor wished to introduce an innovatory curriculum programme in a junior level education course, through the "good offices" of three instructors under his supervision.

As a result of this examination it was discovered that, although the professor's initial perceptions of the innovatory curriculum programme could be considered as within an Emancipatory Code, the instructors taught the

course as an Integrated Code form. Various reasons as to why this occurred were put forward, and this led to a consideration of the problems and difficulties involved in the implementation of an Emancipatory or Integrated form of educational knowledge code in a North American, course-based, university situation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis owes much to many people, but special mention must be made of the following. Professor J.R.Young, whose help as a supervisor went far beyond the call of duty; Professors M.K.Bacchus and A.K.Davis who read the submitted work so swiftly, and whose comments I found very helpful; and the three graduate teaching assistants, and their students, who gave so generously of their time to provide the empirical content of this thesis. However the thesis would never have been written without the intellectual stimulus and personal encouragement of Professor H.Garfinkle, and the practical and empathetic support of my wife, Eleanor, who, amongst many things, typed this thesis and gave birth, with the minimum of fuss, to a baby boy during its writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I INTRODUCTION 1

The Problem 1

The Area and Significance of the Study .. 3

Methodology 4

Delimitations of the Study 7

Summary 8

Footnotes 9

II EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE CODES AND THE TRANSMISSION OF KNOWLEDGE 11

Bernstein's Theory of Educational Knowledge Codes 11

A Critique of Bernstein's Educational Knowledge Codes 22

Educational Knowledge Codes: The Emancipatory Code 30

Conclusion 38

Footnotes 43

III EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE CODES AND CURRICULUM, PEDAGOGY AND EVALUATION 49

Introduction 49

Curriculum 50

Pedagogy 53

Evaluation 62
62

Summary 69

Footnotes 71

CHAPTER PAGE

IV THE PROFESSOR AS CURRICULUM DEVELOPER 74

Introduction: The Empirical Situation ... 74

The Reorganisation of the Introductory Education Course in the Educational Foundations Department 75

The Role of the Curriculum Developer under the Three Educational Knowledge Codes 82

The Influence of the Professor's Biographical Process as a Contributing Factor to His Philosophy of Education ... 89

The Professor's Conceptualisation of the Course 91

The Professor's Conceptualisation of the Course and Educational Knowledge Codes 97

Summary 100

Footnotes 102

V THE INITIAL PERCEPTIONS OF THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANTS AS COURSE INSTRUCTORS 105

Introduction 105

The Biographical Background of the Graduate Student Instructors and its Influence on their Perceptions of the Course 108

The Instructors' Initial Perceptions of the Course 121

The Instructors' Initial Perceptions of the Course and Educational Knowledge Codes 139

Conclusion 147

Footnotes 149

CHAPTER PAGE

VI THE ROLE OF THE INSTRUCTOR AS PRACTISING PEDAGOGUE 153

Introduction 153

Instructor One's Role as a Practising Pedagogue 156

Instructor Two's Role as a Practising Pedagogue 164

Instructor Three's Role as a Practising Pedagogue 171

The Roles of the Instructors as Practising Pedagogues, and Educational Knowledge Codes 176

Summary 187

Footnotes 189

VII THE STUDENTS AS KNOWLEDGE RECEIVERS 193

Introduction 193

The Biographical Background of the Students 194

The Students as Knowledge Receivers 197

Variations in Student Responses from Section to Section 204

Student Responses and Educational Knowledge Codes 211

Conclusion 219

Footnotes 223

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII CONCLUSION 226

The Problem 226

Implications of the Study for the Implementation of an Emancipatory Code in a North American University Situation 228

Implications of the Study for the Implementation of an Integrated Code 238

Wider Implications of the Study 244

The Influence of the Author's Biographical Experience on His Philosophical Position: A Reflexive Glance 248

Comments on the Assumptions and Methodology Used in the Thesis 253

Footnotes 260

POSTSCRIPT 262

BIBLIOGRAPHY 264

APPENDIX 269

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

The sociology of education, like sociology itself, can be seen to be in a a state of paradigmatic crisis. Whether this crisis should be viewed as the destruction of a previous paradigmatic position, and its subsequent transformation, together with new insights, into a new paradigmatic position;[1] whether it should be viewed as the growing pains of a new academic discipline in a primitive stage of growth, taking its first steps from a monolithic mechanical to a differentiated organic solidarity;[2] or whether it should be viewed as the development of conflicting and pluralistic perspectives essential to the healthy development of a social science discipline;[3] it is far too early to say. However, whatever the eventual outcome, it is quite apparent that Olive Banks' assertion that sociology of education works within a structural-functional paradigm,[4] with its main concern as the doctrine of "order",[5] made in the late 1960s, is no longer viable. It is now possible to recognise, in Britain for example, three conflicting theoretical positions: the continuing structural-functionalist one, the phenomenological position, concentrating on social interaction at a micro level, utilising ideas from people such as Schutz, Merleau Ponty, Marx and Mead; and the new structuralists utilising ideas from people such as Althusser and Luscher.[6]

Nevertheless it is very likely that sociologists of education representing all three positions would today accept that educational knowledge and educational realities are, at least to some extent, socially constructed; and so can be treated as problematic. This represents a major shift in perspective which allows sociologists of education to "make" or define their own problems, rather than merely "take" or accept as unproblematic problems defined by other educators.[7]

One of the major influences in undermining the position of the structural functional paradigm in British sociology of education was the collection of articles edited by M.F.D. Young under the title "Knowledge and Control".[8] While they cover a broad range of subject matter and perspectives Young has argued that:

> What they all hold in common is that they do not take for granted existing definitions of educational reality, and therefore do "make" rather than "take" problems for the sociology of education.[9]

The impact of the book has been such that one writer has described it as representing "a fundamental change within the sociology of education which I shall describe as the emergence of an alternative paradigm".[10]

By treating educational realities as socially constructed and problematic one can raise questions about the curriculum making process, which have traditionally been ignored by curriculum developers using a linear model of curriculum development. It now becomes necessary to give due consideration to institutional constraints, the "personal biographical situations"[11] of both curriculum implementers (teachers) and curriculum receivers (learners), and the pragmatics of the classroom situation, which make the transmission of educational knowledge problematic.

The Area and Significance of the Study.

This study had three main purposes. Firstly, to clarify and adapt Bernstein's theoretical formulation of educational realities in the terms of two educational knowledge codes, one descriptive of current educational situations, the other predictive of future educational situations. Secondly, to formulate a third educational knowledge code in contradistinction to Bernstein's predictive code, as an alternative future educational reality. Thirdly, to use these three educational knowledge codes as the basic structures, within which to empirically examine an innovative curriculum project, being attempted in the Educational Foundations Department of a large Western Canadian University, during a one semester junior level education course.

The emphasis in this study will be on utilising these theoretical frameworks to interpret the empirical reality; although, of course, the validity of the theoretical formulations will, to some extent, be questioned through their capacity to explain and provide understanding of the empirical reality.

In utilising Bernstein's educational knowledge codes it was found necessary to clarify and adapt, to some extent, his original formulations; because, as Daine remarks:

> Many of these concepts ("collection", "code" or "frame strength", "deep structure", to name a few) are both theoretically and empirically obscure.[12]

This I found particularly troublesome with respect to his predictive or Integrated Code teacher-based form; but have succeeded, I hope, while reformulating this code, in retaining the spirit and intention of his work, if not its precise theoretical detail.

This study, then, attempted to expand the area of predictive educational realities presented by Bernstein theoretically, and examine an innovative curriculum project in terms of these theoretical formulations.

Methodology

I have not followed the methodological practice prevalent in positivistic sociology, of establishing a rigid theoretical framework which then focuses the attention of the researcher upon particulart aspects of the empirical situation, but, at the same time, tends to filter out aspects of the empirical situation which are considered irrelevant. I regard this as a dangerous practice since there is a tendency often to provide a total explanation from data which has never even attempted to consider more than a partial social reality. The researcher's commitment to view his empirical situation through his theoretical perspective may well lead him to regard as irrelevant, and usually unimportant, any findings which cannot be accounted for within that theoretical framework.

Therefore, in this thesis, the theoretical framework was fully developed after the end of the empirical research, in the form of a synthesis of my own prior biographical experience, my reading in the area of phenomenology and critical theory, my understanding of Bernstein's theory of educational knowledge codes, and my perceptions of what took place in the empirical situation. The theoretical formulation was then used to reflect upon the data obtained in the empirical situation.

In collecting the empirical data, therefore, my main concern was to obtain as broad a picture of the empirical situation as possible. To do this I used participant observation, semi-structured interviews and questionnaire responses from students at the end of the course.

During the group discussions between the instructors and the professor prior to the beginning of the course, I was both participant and observer, utilising the services of a tape-recorder. I used the tape-recorder also for interviews with the professor and instructors, prior to the beginning of the course, where their initial perceptions concerning the course were investigated.

During the course I interviewed the instructors at the end of the first month, and every week thereafter, concerning their role as a teacher in the previous week, and also took part in and tape-recorded, an evaluation meeting at the end of the first month and at the end of the course. This provided me with data regarding the instructors' perceptions of the ongoing classroom situation, and was supplemented by my own perceptions obtained by participant observation in the classrooms of the three instructors.

Student viewpoints on the nature and success of the course were sought by means of interviews with a stratified random sample of eight students from each section, and by responses to an end of course questionnaire; while data concerning the students' own biographies were sought through another questionnaire, also administered at the end of the course.

The methodology used in this thesis was unusual; but it was an attempt, albeit a crude and at times ill-thought out attempt, to utilise the Marxian notion of reflexive praxis.

Delimitations of the Study

The empirical situation which was investigated in this thesis was a one semester, junior level, introductory education course in the Educational Foundations Department of a large Western Canadian university. In this investigation it was assumed that the institutional setting within which this course was taught could be taken as that of an "ideal typical", Bernsteinian course-based Collection Code form.[13]

In utilising my adaptation of Bernstein's Integrated and Collection Codes it was assumed that these codes were adaptable for the examination of intra-institutional settings in education as well as inter-institutional settings. My own experience in an English College of Education does suggest that the two forms of code can be found co-existing, albeit uneasily, in such institutions.

Since, empirically, I was concerned with a particular type of university situation, the wider implications which can be drawn from the analysis of the data are clearly limited, in the main part, to like institutional settings. The three educational knowledge codes developed in chapters two and three, however, can be utilised in the examination of all educational situations, rather than merely the specialised instance examined in this thesis.

Summary

This chapter has very briefly touched upon the nature of, and area which, this thesis will cover.

In Chapter Two I critically examine Bernstein's theory of educational knowledge codes, and suggest why it is necessary to formulate an educational knowledge code which is an alternative to his Integrated Code. In Chapter Three I try and indicate the implications, in terms of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation, of the three knowledge codes. Chapters Four, Five, Six and Seven are concerned with examining the empirical situation in the light of the theoretical perspectives, and Chapter Eight considers the implications of attempting to introduce Emancipatory or Integrated Code forms into a course-based Collection Code university situation, as well as some of the wider implications for society in general, together with a criticism of the methodology used in the thesis.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Adapting Kuhn's argument for the development of a natural science to the development of the sociology of education. Thomas S.Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions University of Chicago Press, revised edition 1970.

[2] As one might infer by viewing the development of an academic discipline as the development of society in microcosm, within a Durkheimian perspective. E.Durkheim, The Division of Labour in Society translated by G.Simpson, Free Press 1964, first published 1893.

[3] Applying to the sociology of education an argument that Dr.N.Stehr has used with respect to sociology (in conversation at the University of Alberta).

[4] Olive Banks, The Sociology of Education Batsford 1968.

[5] As defined by Dawe it "asserts the paramount necessity, for societal and individual well-being, of external constraint; hence the notion of a social system ontologically and methodologically prior to its participants". Alan Dawe, "The Two Sociologies" in British Journal of Sociology XXI (2) 1970 p. 214. This position is, of course, fundamentally conservative with its main concern as the maintenance and stability of societal systems.

[6] These positions were suggested by S.J.Eggleston, in seminar at the University of Alberta March 1975.

[7] I am using "make" and "take" in the manner suggested by Seeley in J.Seeley, "The 'Making' and 'Taking' of Problems". Social Problems Volume 14 1966.

[8] M.F.D.Young, Knowledge and Control - New Directions for the Sociology of Education Collier-MacMillan 1971.

[9] Ibid. pp.2-3.

[10] D.A.Gorbutt, "The New Sociology of Education" in Education for Teaching Nov. 1972.

[11] Used in the Schutzian sense of "the uniqueness of our fellow-man in his unique biographical situation". Alfred Schutz, Collected Papers Vol. I, Martinus Nijhoff 1962 p. 18.

[12] As explicated in Bernstein op. cit., and Chapter II of this thesis.

[13] Patricia J.W.Daine, Educational Knowledge Codes: An Analysis of the Bernstein Typology unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1973.

[14] Appendix I.

[15] Bernstein op. cit.

CHAPTER II

EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE CODES AND THE TRANSMISSION OF KNOWLEDGE

Bernstein's Theory of Educational Codes

Very few sociologists of education have given much attention to the relationships between what is classified as educational knowledge, the nature of the society in which that knowledge is so classified, and the utilisation of that knowledge in educational institutions.[1] The best known, and in my view qualitatively the best, article to deal with this matter has been written by Basil Bernstein[2].

In this article[2] Bernstein develops two typologies of educational knowledge, initiated to some extent, by what he perceives is happening in English educational institutions[3]. He argues that "formal educational knowledge" is realised through three "message systems": curriculum, i.e. what is defined as valid knowledge; pedagogy, i.e. what is defined as valid transmission of that knowledge; and evaluation, i.e. what is defined as valid realization of that knowledge on the part of the taught[4].

Bernstein suggests that these three message systems represent the empirical realisation of one of two alternative underlying structures of educational knowledge, which he terms the "Integrated"[5] and "Collection"[5] educational knowledge codes.

Bernstein sees the Collection Code as based on a concept of knowledge as private property. This knowledge is divided up into highly formalised discipline areas which acknowledge few links between each other, or between educational knowledge and the knowledge used in the outside world. This structure of knowledge leads to a strongly hierarchical relationship between teacher and student, where the teacher is considered the expert giver, and the student as the ignorant receiver of knowledge. However, the teacher is, himself, at the lower end of a scale of strongly hierarchical relationships between himself, his professional superiors, and the educational knowledge decision makers, i.e. those who decide what will be counted as educational knowledge and how that knowledge shall be structured. Evaluation under such a system will concentrate on the student's ability to realise the "taught" knowledge content in the manner prescribed by the teacher.

On the other hand, Bernstein argues, the Integrated Code is based on the concept of knowledge as process. It lays an emphasis on general principles and concepts, on ways of knowing rather than on attaining states of knowledge. Teachers provide open-ended learning situations for students rather than giving knowledge content per se. Deliberate attempts are made to relate educational knowledge to the knowledge of the everyday world; and teachers, not only have more open and democratic relationships with their students, but also, as a professional group, exercise much more control over what they do in the classroom.

To analyse the two forms of educational knowledge codes Bernstein uses the concepts of Classification; which he defines as "the degree of boundary maintenance between contents",[5] i.e. the degree of separation between institutionally validated areas of educational study; and framing; which he defines as the "degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organization and pacing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship"[6] and the "strength of the boundary between educational knowledge and everyday community knowledge of teacher and taught".[6]

Within this analytical framework, generally speaking, the stronger the classification and framing the more closely the empirical educational reality resembles a Collection Code; and the weaker the classification and framing the more closely it resembles an Integrated Code. However Bernstein does suggest that the defined strength of classification and framing of Collection Codes varies in different types of education system. Thus he suggests that "the European, non-specialised, subject-based form of collection involves strong classification but exceptionally strong framing. That is at levels below higher education",[7] while the English version "involves exceptionally strong classification, but relatively weaker framing than the European type",[7] and "The course-based non-specialized U.S.A. form of the collection . . . has the weakest classification and framing of the collection code".[8] At the same time he points out that, while the classification in Integrated Codes will always be weak the framing situation will be more complex. While the frame will be weak initially, as an Integrated Code becomes established and more teachers in an educational institution work within its perspective, the extent of control which any individual teacher can exercise over curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation[9] will decline. But there will be concurrently an increased area of self determination allowed for the student. Therefore, the frame is strengthened in terms of the teacher but weakened in terms of the student; thereby producing "a shift in the balance of power, in the pedagogical relationship between teacher and taught".[10]

Thus Bernstein sees a move from Collection to Integrated Codes as involving major transformations in curriculum[11], pedagogy[11] and evaluation[11]. These changes, he argues, make order problematic in an Integrated Code situation. In a Collection Code:

> Social order arises out of the hierarchical nature of the authority relationships out of the systematic ordering of the differentiated knowledge in time and space, out of an explicit, usually predictable, examining procedure[12].

But in an Integrated Code, due to weak modes of classification, generally weaker modes of framing and more egalitarian forms of social relationships, Bernstein argues, there are four conditions which must be fulfilled, otherwise neither teachers nor students will "have a sense of time, place or purpose".[12]

These conditions are:

1. Consensus about the underlying integrating framework of knowledge and a high level of interpersonal co-operation due to the much greater individual freedom of action.
2. The clear enunciation of the relationship between the underlying framework and the educational knowledge to be utilised in the classroom situation; because:

> The development of such a co-ordinating framework will be the process of socialization of teachers into the code. During this process the teachers will internalize, as in all processes of socialization, the interpretative procedures of the Code so that these become implicit guides which regulate and co-ordinate the behaviour of the individual teachers[13].

3. A means, within the educational institution, of monitoring the teaching and learning process, since the "evaluative criteria are likely to be relatively weak",[14] to provide feedback. Bernstein suggests that some form of committee might perform this function and also act as "a further agency of socialization into the code".[14]
4. "Clear criteria of evaluation" for without them, argues Bernstein "neither teacher nor taught have any means to consider the significance of what is learned, nor any means

to judge the pedagogy".[14]

Having briefly explained how Bernstein sees educational knowledge codes influencing the situational realities of educational institutions, let me indicate the relationship he perceives between educational knowledge codes and the changing nature of society.

In one of the most quoted, and least examined, statements in "On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge", Bernstein has suggested that:

> How a society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control[15].

This appears to suggest a view of educational knowledge codes as merely a reflective subsystem of society as a whole. Since Bernstein has suggested that "educational knowledge is a major regulator of the structure of experience"[15] it would seem reasonable to suggest in turn that Bernstein views society as ontologically and methodologically prior to the individual. Thus, underlying Bernstein's conceptualisation of the relationship between society, educational knowledge and educational practice is the belief that:

> Since individuals cannot of their own volition create and maintain order, constraint is necessary for society to exist at all; without it, the only

> possibility is the war of all against all. Accordingly, society must define the social meanings, relationships and action of its members for them. And, because it is thus assigned priority over them, it must in some sense, be self-generating and self-maintaining[16].

There is further support for this view in his analysis of possible reasons for a move from Collection to Integrated Codes. He firstly suggests that there are several reasons for this move which can be hypothesised as arising from technology and its influence on society. Thus rapid developments in the specifics of high status knowledge, especially of a scientific and technological variety, make it essential that one concentrates on "ways of knowing" rather than "acquiring states of knowledge".[17] Equally rapid changes in the nature of industrial technology necessitate the ability to absorb new skills and understandings. At the same time Bernstein suggests the development of "a range of legitimizing beliefs and ideologies"[18] creates "a major problem of control . . . and the problem of inner regulation of the person"[18]. In this situation the wider area of student behaviour available for influence under an Integrated Code make it a useful instrument of socialization into the norms of society.

All the above would suggest that for Bernstein:

> The problem of order can only be solved by conceiving of the actor as a reflex of the social system and meaning as a reflex of the cultural system.[19]

However, having made these suggestions about reasons for a movement from Collection to Integrated Codes, Bernstein then goes on to suggest that there may be another more fundamental reason. Perhaps this movement symbolizes a paradigmatic crisis in "society's basic classifications and frames".[20] In this case Integrated Codes are being used to destroy the "structures of power and principles of control".[20] Therefore they become "symptoms of a moral crisis rather than the terminal state of an educational system".[20] This is where Bernstein leaves the discussion, giving us no indication of what might lead to a new formulation of educational knowledge, and presumably society.

Thus Bernstein presents opposing reasons for the movement towards an Integrated Code, on the one hand seeing it as the adaptability of education to the needs of an advanced technological society; while on the other hand as the struggle of members of society to adapt to changing material circumstances. However, whichever view one accepts, they both reflect Bernstein's over-riding concern with the maintenance of societal stability and order. If we accept the first set of reasons for a movement toward Integrated Codes then we are accepting a model of man as reflexive to the needs of society. If we accept the second reason then we see the movement towards Integrated Codes as a moral crisis in the basic classifications and frames of society

Whichever of Bernstein's interpretations one accepts they both seem to agree with Durkheim's argument that:

> In sum, education, far from having as its unique or principal object the individual and his interests, is above all the means by which society perpetually recreates the conditions of its very existence.[21]

Further support for the argument that Bernstein is taking an essentially Durkheimian position on the relationship between education and society is to be found in his description of the movement from Collection to Integrated Codes of educational knowledge as a symbolisation of "a crisis in society's basic classifications and frames".[22] Bernstein has also acknowledged his intellectual debt to Durkheim on several occasions. The importance of this debt is alluded to in "Class Codes and Control", Volume I, where, in the biographical introduction, Bernstein writes, "I read Durkheim and although I did not understand him it all seemed to happen".[23]

Thus Bernstein seems ultimately to be supporting Durkheim's position when he asks how educational problems can even be identified:

> If we do not go back to the very source of educational life, that is to say, to society? It is society that must be examined; it is society's needs that must be known, since it is society's needs that must be satisfied[25].

His concern for social order in an Integrated Code context is that it has, to some extent at least, to be achieved by participants in the curriculum-making process. For Bernstein, working within an "order"[25] perspective of social reality, this becomes symptomatic of crisis because, within this perspective "individuals cannot of their own volition create and maintain order, constraint is necessary for society to exist at all".[26]

In summary then I would suggest, and this is implicit in much of Bernstein's work, that the movement towards Integrated Codes reflect the changing nature of cognitive needs in advanced industrial societies, the changing functions of education in society and a perceived need to mask the ideology of elite control in society. Thus the rapidly changing knowledge content of many academic disciplines has reduced the importance of imbibing large amounts of such content in favour of attempting to come to terms with underlying concepts which have remained as relatively stable frameworks.[27] The declining importance of the church and family as agencies of social control have increased pressure on the school, as the one institution which all individuals in advanced industrialised societies are forced to attend, as an agency of social control. This has produced pressure for educational institutions to widen what they define as valid educational knowledge to include areas concerned with the explication and internalising of norms of society.[28]

However, the extension of education into the everyday world, and the consequent blurring of boundaries between everyday and educational knowledge, create problems for the authoritarian structures of a Collection Code situation. The rhetoric of democratic ideology[29] associated with everyday reality, that dominates the thinking in many western industrialised states, may necessitate changes in the structure and organisation of an educational reality which attempts to include this area within its definition of relevance. This may lead to the creation of increased choice and decision-making powers for students in an educational situation of apparent increased equality, which masks implicit ideological consensus. It will, at the same time, increase the control which teachers, as an occupational group, can exercise over the curriculum.

Thus the unstreaming of classes and extension of educational realities to encompass areas of the everyday world, together with the continued emphasis on verbal skills and techniques and the possible mystification of evaluation procedures,[30] may create, under an Integrated Code, situations where the superior 'abilities' of children from bourgeois homes can be made manifestly 'open under an implicit ideology of bourgeois democracy.[31]

A Critique of Bernstein's Educational Knowledge Codes

In the development of his educational knowledge codes Bernstein does two things. Firstly, he presents his interpretation of current educational realities, which he sees as rooted in the needs of nineteenth and early twentieth century society for "submissive but inflexible man". Secondly, he presents an interpretation of hypothetical future educational realities, which he terms the Integrated Code. That this code is predictive rather than descriptive is clear form Bernstein's own admission that:

> The code at the moment exists at the level of ideology and theory, with only a relatively small number of schools and educational agencies attempting to institutionalize it with any seriousness.[32]

Where then does Bernstein draw his evidence for a move towards a new code?

He suggests two possibilities, the first which, starting from his assumptiom that education is a reflective sub-system of society, argues that these changes in the validation, organisation and distribution of educational knowledge are merely adjustments in the sub-system to meet the changing needs of society. As such it is the simplistic answer of a functionalist, which leaves the problem of the distribution of power and the exercise of control within society as impermeable unproblematics. However Bernstein is clearly not very happy with this answer because he poses another and much more difficult one. He suggests that the move from Collection to Integrated Codes:

> Symbolizes that there is a crisis in society's basic classifications and frames and therefore a crisis in its structures of power and principles of control,[33]

and sees the crisis as stemming from a crisis in "the class structure and its legitimizing ideology".[34]

In this situation Bernstein lays down four conditions which must be satisfied for an Integrated Code, otherwise it "may produce a culture in which neither staff nor pupils have a sense of time, place or purpose".[35] I have already described these conditions and so do not intend to repeat them here, but rather will comment on them. Each of these conditions calls for teachers to act as controlling and active definers of educational realities working out common curricula, pedagogies and means of evaluation. If Bernstein sees this as a reflection of what is or should be happening at the societal level we are given no indication of it. However, whether he intended this or not, it would appear that, under an Integrated Code Bernstein would expect to see, at the educational institutional level, much greater differentiation of defined educational realities. Since he tied this to an increasing linkage between educational and community knowledge we would expect, at the same time, that these educational realities would reflect the community interests of the community from which the institution draws its clientele. In fact, in the instances where some form of Integrated Code has been attempted, the community knowledge which is utilised has been distorted by class bias.[36] This is not surprising given the fact that teachers tend to come from upwardly mobile working class and lower middle class family backgrounds with strong affinities to bourgeois values and understandings.[37]

Under an Integrated Code, for the learner therefore, the objectified realities of knowledge, organised in the form of disciplines, is replaced by objectified realities in the form of bourgeois teacher defined situations. In either case the educational situation does not deal with the realities of the learner's world.

> It is not personal to him, is not part of his nature; therefore he does not fulfil himself in work but actually denies himself........ It satisfies no spontaneous creative urge, but is only a means for the satisfaction of wants which have nothing to do with work.[38]

For the worker such satisfaction is centred round money and sustenance, for the learner in the educational situation such satisfaction centres on what Becker et al have called the "grade point average" perspective.[39]

It should be noted that this perspective will be revealed in rather different ways under Collection and Integrated Codes. Under a Collection Code it will be judged largely in terms of intelligence and right and wrong responses as defined by the prior structures of educational knowledge of the discipline.[40] Under an Integrated Code it will be judged more in terms of commitment, curiosity and ability to empathise with the teacher's perspective.[41] In both cases however, teacher evaluations of what the learner has "learnt" are a major, if not over-riding, concern of both teacher and learner.

I should note here that, while the alienation of the learner from his learning world tends to be similar for all learners under a Collection Code, under an Integrated Code the similar class origins and interests of bourgeois teacher and learner may well provide some intrinsic meaning in the learning situation for such a learner. This, combined with the tendencies of teachers to over-estimate the learning capacities of such learners,[42] may well create situations where the superior "abilities" of learners from bourgeois homes can be made manifestly open under an implicit ideology of bourgeois democracy.

Therefore, although I have suggested that Bernstein has already moved away from the notion of education merely as a reflective sub-system of society by providing teachers, under an Integrated Code, with the opportunity to control and create their own educational realities; the learning experiences for the majority will still tend to be alienating. Such a result might well be interpreted, therefore, as merely a reflection of the societal trend of devolution of power and social control to a larger proportion of the bourgeoisie;[44] or, more probably, a move from the exercise of social control by dominant groups through open repression to the exercise of social control by the manipulation of "legitimate" social understandings through the mass media and the various "legitimised" institutions of society.

For Bernstein, then, education remains, under both forms of educational knowledge code, inherently ideological, so that the relationship between educational knowledge and the structures of power and principles of social control in society remain unquestioned. Thus education, even under an Integrated Code, never goes beyond a consideration of the "relationship between consciousness and socially-approved, socially distributed knowledge".[45] Accordingly, the model of man as a learner under an Integrated Code, as Bernstein remarks, is that of "conforming but flexible man".[46]

The question we must now raise is can education ever become an agency of social change? Certainly there is a tradition amongst educationalists, since the time of Plato onwards at least, which has consistently argued that education can in fact carry out this role. There is a growing body of evidence from the so-called Communist countries and the Third World to suggest that education is being used in such a fashion; but it is always at the behest of the governing elite and, as such, remains ideological in nature. To phrase the question differently therefore, - can education become a leading sector, in the Rostowian sense,[47] which will actually change the distribution of power and means of social control in society - can education produce, in advanced industrial societies, the type of changes which Marx argued only revolution could bring? The question is a very important one for, if Bernstein's analysis of advanced industrial societies, as in a crisis of "class structure and legitimizing ideology",[48] is correct, then we are facing a situation similar to that just prior to the "Civil War" in England, to that just prior to the Revolution of 1789 in France and the Revolution of 1917 in Russia. We are, then, according to Bernstein in a situation of incipient revolution.

The resolution of this situation for Marx and most Marxists is a simple bloody revolution; where the industrial proletariat rise up, overthrow the bourgeoisie and their bourgeois democracy, and replace it with the dictatorship of the proletariat. Yet it is an interesting, and little examined phenomenon, that Marxist revolution has never been successful in a fully fledged bourgeois democracy. Such revolutions have only been successful in unseating ruling elites in pre-industrial, pre-bourgeois societies such as China, Russia or Cuba. In advanced industrial societies such as Britain, France and Italy, Communists participate in the system and attempt to use the means of the system to gain control of it. There is a rejection in practice, though perhaps not in theory, of the whole notion of revolution. But, even if such communist parties gained control, either through revolution or through free elections, all the evidence from current communist states points to the establishment, in education, of an Integrated Code form resting "upon an explicit and closed ideological basis".[49] As such the learner will remain alienated from his own learning experience for it will be structured in meanings other than his own.

It is sometimes forgotten in the furore over Marx's revolutionary philosophy that, for him, revolution was merely a means to an end, an end which he saw as the creation of a form of society where all men can control their own destinies, where all men, in harmonious intercourse, exercise their creative talents to determine the conditions of their own existence. In such a society:

> The object of labour is, therefore the objectification of man's species life; for he no longer reproduces himself merely intellectually, as in consciousness, but actively and in a real sense, and he sees his own reflection in a world which he has constructed.[50]

Therefore it becomes possible to question the means of Marx while accepting his ends and his model of the true nature of man; which is cooperative, controlling, creative and reflexive.

Since, clearly, societal conditions today do not allow man to act out his real potential we may pose the question - can education achieve the existential changes in reality which Marx sought to achieve through revolution?

It would certainly appear that educational institutions have, today, an unprecedented potential for the exercise of power over the lives of individuals in society. Thus, with the declining stability of both nuclear and extended families and the declining influence of the church, the peer group as a centre of stability and influence is increasing in importance. But educationsl institutions, as the institutional meeting places for such peer groups, therefore also have a potentially increased sphere of influence over the lives of their clientele, and have an unprecedented length of time during which that influence may be exercised. Added to this it is only in educational institutions that, in theory at least, the main purpose of work in society is to explore and develop learning potentials unhampered, at least until the time of higher education, by such mundane practicalities as the provision of the physical necessities of life. Yet it would appear, at least at the level of the high school that the influence of the school is declining as increasingly large numbers of students take to truancy or drop out in protest against a world of which they are not a part. And it is likely that this is merely the tip of an iceberg where despondency and resignation are the norm and the world of the learner increasingly only achieves meaning through the grades he is "awarded". In this regard it is interesting to note that the few situations I know of where an Integrated Code form has been introduced in the high school appear to have had relatively little influence on the level of truancy and drop-out.

Therefore I would suggest that, only when we take a radically different view of education and the role of the teacher and learner in educational situations, can we conceive of the possibility that education will be able to act as a leading sector in society and achieve "take-off" towards the making of new forms of society where all men can be controlling, creative, reflexive actors fulfilling their full potentials as human beings.

This different view of education I shall formulate in the form of another educational knowledge code which I shall call the Emancipatory Code.

Educational Knowledge Codes : the Emancipatory Code.

I have argued that the Collection and Integrated Codes reflect different perspectives within what Dawe describes as "the doctrine of order",[51] and as such represent different forms of the exercise of control over education in the interests of an ideological elite. Collection Codes, by representing, for all who do not obtain educational elite status, educational knowledge as based on a series of unchanging logical, ontological "truths". Integrated Codes, by representing educational knowledge as rational choice within a framework of hidden ideological consensus.

In both cases educational reality is perceived as a reflexive response to an ontologically and methodologically prior notion of "society".

However Dawe has argued that there is another perspective or doctrine which philosophers, sociologists, educators and others have adhered to. This he terms "the problem of control" and argues its concern is essentially with:

> The problem of how human beings could regain control over essentially man-made institutions and historical situations".[52]

Amongst sociologists who have taken this perspective are Marx, Weber,Lukacs, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Habermas and the "Frankfurt School". I should point out that this perspective is a characteristic of the early work of Marx, Weber, and Lukacs, who all, at least to some extent, moved towards a concern for the "doctrine of order" in later life. As well, some writers such as Sartre and Merleau-Ponty show greater concern for each individual per se; while others, such as Marx and Habermas are more concerned with individuals and social groups. But all these writers are concerned with:

> The linking concepts of meaning and action; the concepts of ends as desired future states, and of the existing situation as providing conditions to be transcended or overcome and means to be utilized; and the notion of actors defining their own situations and attempting to control them in terms of their definitions.[53]

I would argue that, for a complete typology of knowledge codes, one must have a category which deals with this dimension of sociological understanding. Therefore I suggest that another code must be established: this code I shall call Emancipatory.

It is difficult to talk about this code in terms of Bernstein's analytical categories of classification and framing; because under such a code the whole concept of classification and framing would be viewed as the imposition of a reified social structure upon the individual and social reality of the educational situation. Under such a code classification is defined through dialogue between the participants in the educational situation; and framing is only constrained by the individually and socially perceived needs of the individual actors achieved in a dialectical synthesis of experiential interest, self-perceived cognitive need and the objective conditions of social existence.

Since this code is based on an ontology of knowledge and human interest[54] the learner will only be in a position to learn when he is committed to act upon his world.[55] The action orientation of the Emancipatory code represents a crucial difference between it and an Integrated Code. In an Integrated Code there is considerable emphasis placed on individual understanding at a conceptual level, and to that extent the learner can be seen as "active" rather than "passive".[56] But this is not active in the sense meant in the Emancipatory Code; where not only is the learning process active in itself, but also the understanding being gained is for active use by the individual in the transformation of his reality.

At the same time the eventual goal under an Emancipatory Code is an understanding of social realities which extend to the totality of man as species being, rather than merely understandings which are shaped by the ideology of the society in which the learner lives. This means that the possibilities for praxis under an Emancipatory Code are radically different from those under an Integrated Code, because praxis under an Emancipatory Code is founded on the understanding that:

> The practical construction of an objective world, the manipulation of inorganic nature, is the confirmation of man as a conscious species-being, i.e. a being who treats the species as his own being or himself as a species-being . . . It is just in his work upon the objective world that man really proves himself as a species being. This production is his species-life. By means of it nature appears as his world and his reality. The object of labour is, therefore the objectification of man's species-being.[57]

Evaluation under the Emancipatory Code does not exist as an external teacher imposed order of reality, which is institutionally organized and societally approved. The imposition of such an order would be considered as the reification of teacher and institutional reality at the expense of the emancipation of the learner. Evaluation under the Emancipatory Code is by the individual learner or learners who consider the situationally specific, experiential worth of a particular educational activity to them as an individual or group of individuals.

The implications of a move to an Emancipatory Code are little short of revolutionary for the nature of educational institutions, their relationship to the rest of society and their internal organization.

The notion of educational institiutions as processing plants, working within particular time frames, to produce educational products will have to be abandoned.[58] This will mean the realisation of the idea of "l'education permanente" and the total integration of education into the social reality of the everyday world. As such it is part of a movement to make occupation, leisure and education integral parts of the realisation of man's full potential as a human being.[59] Thus the whole notion of educational institutions, separate and isolated from the rest of society will be inappropriate.

Similarly the role of the teacher must change dramatically. His function as a gatekeeper of success will become redundant. He operates in an educational situation which may be concerned with the development of more specific skills and understandings or with the pursuit of the larger societal perspective. But, whichever is the case, his role will be to facilitate learning, by the individual and the group, as defined by them in that particular educational situation. Such educational realities must for the learner "signify possibility for him as an existing person, mainly concerned with making sense of his own life-world";[60] they must allow the learner to make his own "rationality", in the Merleau-Ponty sense, so that "perspectives blend, perceptions confirm each other, a meaning emerges".[61]

At the same time the teacher becomes the learner as the learner, drawing on his own unique experiential world, casts new insights on old problems. Thus the teacher and learner, through a dialectical synthesis of learning and teaching, achieve greater understanding of their own and each other's experiential world of social reality.

The problems involved in the implementation of an Emancipatory Code are enormous for they involve, as well as a complete restructuring of educational institutions and the functions they perform in society, a recognition by all men that we have the capacities to exercise control over the world in which we live. Such a code requires an ability to accept a continuing state of ambiguity, differentiation and conflict, a recognition that "contradiction exists universally and in all processes".[62]

Attempts to implement forms of an Emancipatory Code in educational situations have been very few in number. Freire's exploration of literacy with Brazilian peasants is, perhaps, the best known, together with A.S.Neill's experiment at Summerhill; but some of the teaching activities that went on during the "troubles" at Berkeley, and the attempts by various radical university groups, notably the S.D.S. in Germany,[63] have also begun to explore the possibilities of this code. However, like the Integrated Codes,[64] the Emancipatory Code truly exists only at the level of ideology and theory.

A major criticism of the notion of an Emancipatory Code, as I have presented it above, is that it takes little or no account of the institutional constraints which operate on the freedom of the individual and the possibilities of achieving radical change in these institutions. Certainly many of the writers who can be seen to reflect, at least partially, this perspective do seem to underplay the importance of institutional constraint or more often ignore it altogether.[65] However, at the risk of being accused of the same fault, let me say that, only by conceiving of all men as capable of acting upon the world in which they live, can I conceive of all men as being truly human. Equally, only by exercising their capacity to act upon that world to the full, can men develop their true potential as human beings.

A real problem in all advanced industrial societies is the manipulation of societal structures and institutions by members of dominant elites to perpetuate their positions of power and dominance.[66] Thus we find that the supposedly "democratic" process of educational differentiation in the school situation is manipulated to the benefit of children of dominant elite groups, both in the selection of what is considered valid educational knowledge,[67] and in the informal processes of selection and advice given concerning the educational possibilities available to children.[68] Only by accepting that man is ontologically and methodologically prior to society can we hope to unmask the ideologies of democratic or socialist control to reveal the manipulative practices that allow elite groups to retain control and authority in society.

I have tended to concentrate on the subjective, individualistic, element of the pedagogical process in my discussion of Emancipatory Codes.

However, my view of emancipation is very different from that of the North American humanist psychologists, such as Rogers or Maslow. I would accept that they have a dimension of human learning and understanding that is missed by the Marxian determinists of the Stalinist and Althusserian Schools, and have attempted to integrate this into my model of an Emancipatory Code. But, without the determination to investigate and unmask the ideologies through which members of the dominant elite exercise the means of social control, their philosophies remain ideologically unreflexive, and implicitly acknowledge that men must live within the given structures of society. In a sense, we can see their work as an attempt to universalise the bourgeois principles of individualistic freedom, within the structural status quo of a society governed by the control mechanisms of a bourgeois ideology.

Their position, I would suggest, ignores the vitally important dimensions of man as a social, species being; and man as an active creator of his social world.

Emancipation can only be achieved by a synthesis of the perceptions of men as unique individuals, as members and representatives of "man" as species kind, and as active, creative controllers of their social world. Thus the individual and social elements of men must be synthesised round the notion of radical, reflexive praxis.

Conclusion

In this conclusion I shall briefly sum up the implications of each knowledge code for the various aspects of classification and framing which Bernstein brings up.

In terms of classification or the degree of boundary maintenance between subject contents the major difference is between Collection Code forms and the other two codes. Both Emancipatory and Integrated Code forms view educational knowledge as essentially non disciplinary.

In terms of the various aspects of framing the situation is complex, and to some extent, depends upon which area of framing one is considering. Clearly the framing is strong for Collection Codes where the relationship between everyday and educational knowledge is concerned, while the framing for Integrated and Emancipatory Codes is weaker. However there certainly has, in practice, been far too little attempt to really investigate the existential reality of learners. What has tended to happen, therefore, is that teachers have assumed that the reality of the learner is akin to that of an ideal typification of a middle class learner.[69] Therefore, the strength of framing under an Integrated Code will vary according to the social class of the teacher and learner and the personal ideology of the teacher. Under an Emancipatory Code though, by definition, the framing, in this respect must be weak.

The degree of control which the teacher has over the selection, organisation and pacing of knowledge is clearly different in each of the three codes. Under the Collection Code the teacher's control over the selection and organisation of knowledge is restricted by the exigencies of the academic discipline within which he works, and by his own experiences within that discipline (as I have suggested previously). Under an Integrated Code the control of the teacher is far greater, although it may be restricted by the influence of colleagues, where a group of teachers are working together. There is also the recognition, at least at a theoretical level, that teacher control should be restricted by a need to relate the learning process to the learner's existential reality. But, as Keddie has shown, in the teaching situation little account is taken of the learner's own reality, especially the reality of working class children.[70]

Under an Emancipatory Code the degree of control of the teacher is restricted by his need to enter the existential world of the learner and use the current needs and understandings of the learner as the starting point for teaching. Added to this the continuing dialogue between teacher and learner, and the increasing control which the learner exercises over his own learning process, will further decrease the control of the teacher.

In terms of the pacing of educational knowledge teacher control under a Collection Code may well be considerably restricted by the demands of external "expert" bodies and prior tradition. The control under an Integrated Code is likely to be less strong and exercised through the collective agreement of teachers in an educational institution. However, under both Collection and Integrated Codes, the demands of educational certification will restrict, to some extent, the control of the teacher over the pacing of knowledge. But, again, the restriction is likely to be greater under Collection than Integrated Codes.

Under an Emancipatory Code the teacher exercises very weak control over the pacing of knowledge as the learner controls this as he does the rest of the learning process.

The degree of control that the learner exercises over the selection, organisation and pacing of knowledge, again, is very different under the three codes. Under a Collection Code it is very small, under an Integrated Code it is greater but is still ultimately relatively small. Thus, while there may be greater choice under an Integrated Code, it is choice firmly limited by the teacher's definition of what is acceptable. But, under an Emancipatory Code, a learner will exercise, from the beginning, very considerable control. Firstly, through the requirement of the teacher to come to terms with the learner's learning reality prior to the beginning of the teaching process. Secondly, through the increasing power which the learner has over his own learning process.

Given the differences in framing and classification between the three codes clearly the pedagogical relationship between the learner and teacher will be very different. Under a Collection Code the teacher, as the accredited expert and giver of knowledge, and the learner, as the ignorant and passive receiver of knowledge, live in a strongly hierarchical relationship. Under an Integrated Code the pedagogical relationship may well appear more equalitarian; but, because the framing situation for the teacher is weaker, his control over the pedagogical relationship may well be greater than under a Collection Code.

Bernstein has suggested that the exercise of control in the pedagogical situation is positional under a Collection Code and interpersonal under an Integrated Code. I would suggest that the exercise of control under a Collection Code is positional, but under an Integrated Code while it may be explicitly interpersonal it rests on implicit assumptions about the relative societal positions of the teacher and learner. Thus the hidden nature of the limitations of control which the teacher may legitimately exercise over the pedagogical situation makes the definition of these limitations much more difficult; and so can lead to situations where the teacher is able to exercise control over a far wider area than his socially defined role might imply.

Under an Emancipatory Code the degree of control which the teacher exercises in the pedagogical relationship is defined in dialogue with the learner and changes to reflect the needs of the learner. However, it is unlikely to ever be very strong and is essentially of a very different kind to that of the teacher under Collection or Integrated Codes.

In the next chapter I shall look more closely at the nature of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation under the codes.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The exceptions include P.Bourdieu, S.J.Eggleston, M.F.D.Young and B.Bernstein.

[2] Basil Bernstein, "On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge" in Knowledge and Control ed. by M.F.D.Young, Collier-MacMillan 1971 pp. 47-69.

[3] Although there is no overt recognition of this by Bernstein anybody familiar with the British educational system will notice that his Integrated and Collection Codes appear to resemble closely "ideal typifications" in the Weberian sense, of the innovative English infant school and the traditional English grammar school. I do not mean to suggest by this that this is all that he has done; rather am I suggesting that the differences between infant schools and English grammar schools were probably the empirical sources upon which Bernstein reflected during his initial theoretical formulations.

[4] Bernstein, op. cit. p. 47.

[5] Ibid. p. 49.

[6] Ibid. p. 50. NOTE: Strong framing reduces the degree of control available to teacher and pupil but increases the degree of separation between educational and everyday community knowledge.

[7] Ibid. p. 52.

[8] Ibid. p. 53.

[9] As defined by Bernstein, op. cit.

[10] Ibid. p. 60.

[11] As previously defined by Bernstein and explicated in the text.

[12] Ibid. p. 63.

[13] Ibid. p. 64.

[14] Ibid. p. 65.

[15] Ibid. p. 47.

[16] Alan Dawe, "The Two Sociologies" in Sociological Perspectives ed. by K.Thompson and J.Tunstall, Penguin 1971, pp. 542-54. First published in Br. Journal of Soc. Vol. 21 1970 pp. 207-18.

[17] Bernstein, op. cit. p. 57.

[18] Ibid. p. 67.

[19] Dawe, op. cit. p. 544.

[20] Bernstein, op. cit. p. 67.

[21] E.Durkheim, "Pedagogy and Sociology" in _School and Society_ ed. by B.R.Cosin, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. 1972 pp. 91-5.

[22] Bernstein, op. cit. p. 67.

[23] Basil Bernstein, _Class Codes and Control Volume I_ aladin Granada Pub. Ltd. p. 20.

[24] Durkheim, op. cit. p. 95.

[25] As defined by Dawe, op. cit. and previously referred to.

[26] Dawe, op. cit. p. 543.

[27] As Thomas S.Kuhn has suggested in "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" University of Chicago Press 1970.

[28] Presentations to the Cameron Commission on Education Reform in Alberta 1959 and points made by Mr. D.Ledgerwood of the Alberta Provincial Department of Education concerning pressures for a change in the Social Studies Curriculum, made in the late 1960s; are examples of this. However, I should point out that I do not wish to suggest that "norms of society" are meant to reflect necessarily either the general interests of most individuals in that society or the interests of a society perceived as above and beyond the reality of the individuals who make up that society. In fact, in my view, the "norms of society" usually refers to the operationalised ideological interests of a ruling elite.

[29] I am referring here to the myth of equality of educational and occupational opportunity and the egalitarian nature of social relations which has been peddled so successfully, especially in the U.S.A.

[30] As suggested by Bernstein, 1971 op. cit.

[31] The comments in the last paragraph may be seen as an extension and expansion of Bernstein's notion of the possibility of "intrusive socialization" under an Integrated Code. Bernstein, 1971 op. cit. p. 67.

[32] Bernstein, op. cit. p. 59.

[33] Ibid. p. 67.

[34] Bernstein, 1973 op. cit. p. 267.

[35] Bernstein, 1971 op. cit. p. 64.

[36] As I have frequently observed in my visits to English Primary Schools and as S.J.Eggleston remarked in his lecture at the University of Alberta May 1975.

[37] e.g. of students in British Colleges of Education in 1961-2 80% of the men and 86% of the women, had fathers in skilled manual or more highly classified occupations. The figures for post-graduate students in teacher training were still more highly orientated towards middle class occupations. Higher Education (Robbins Report H.M.S.O. 1963)
Swift has also suggested that the parents of upwardly mobile working class children can be recognised by one of two characteristics: a desire for the child to achieve an improved occupational status and income, which he suggests reflects the father's orientation; or a desire for the child to achieve the values of and enter into a middle class group, which he suggests reflects the mother's orientation. Since teaching is not generally regarded as a particularly prestigious or well paid occupation of itself, I would suggest that it attracts the type of child/adult with the latter type of orientation; because it represents, particularly for a woman, entry into a middle class group and an explicit avowal of bourgeois ideological positions. D.F.Swift "Social Class and Achievement Motivation" in Basic Readings in the Sociology of Education ed. by D.F.Swift, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. 1970
In this regard it is worth noting that in 1961-2 48% of men and 42% cf women in Colleges of Education had fathers whose occupations were classified as clerical or skilled manual. (Robbins Report, Ibid.).

[38] Karl Marx, "Alienated Labour" in Man Alone Alienation in Modern Society ed. by E.Josephson and M.Josephson, Dell Pub. Co. 1962 p. 97.

[39] S.Becker, B.Geer and E.C.Hughes, Making the Grade - The Academic Side of College Life John Wiley and Sons 1968.

[40] Geoffrey M.Esland, "Teaching and Learning as the Organization of Knowledge" in Young, op. cit. p. 89.

[41] Ibid. p. 95.

[42] Nell Keddie, "Classroom Knowledge" in Young, op. cit. p. 151.

[43] See above, footnote [31].

[44] I should add that, although this is a possible interpretation of the changing nature of power in society; I, myself, would tend to agree with C.W.Mills, who describes the changing nature of power in society in terms of an increasing concentration of power in the hands of a few and a subsequent feeling of alienation and loss of control over existential realities by even large numbers of bourgeois workers.
C.Wright Mills, White Collar Oxford U.P. 1951.

[45] Esland, op. cit. p. 94.

[46] Bernstein, 1971 op. cit. p. 67.

[47] As used by him in his seminal book, W.W.Rostow The Process of Economic Growth Norton 1952, to refer to the cotton industry's role as the initial stimulus for the British Industrial Revolution.

[48] See above, footnote [34].

[49] Bernstein 1971, op. cit.

[50] Karl Marx, "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts - First Manuscript" in Karl Marx - Early Writings ed. by T.B.Bottomore, McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1964 p. 128.

[51] Dawe, op. cit. p. 545.

[52] Dawe, op. cit. p. 548.

[53] Dawe, op. cit. p. 548.

[54] Human interest is used here to reflect the phenomenological "intentionality of consciousness" combined with the Marxian notion of "action".

[55] Maxine Greene, "Curriculum and Consciousness" in Teachers Record Volume 73 Number 2 Dec. 1971.

[56] This is the interpretation of "active" used by Esland in Young, op. cit. pp. 70-115.

[57] Ibid. pp. 127-8.

[58] This problem, of the treatment of human beings as products of mechanical machinery, extends far beyond education. The fascination with technical efficiency at the expense of human reality is a problem which bedevils all advanced industrial societies.
Apple has eloquently discussed this problem in relation to

the use of Systems Management in education, in M.W.Apple, "The Adequacy of Systems Management Procedures in Education and Alternatives" in Journal of Educational Research 1972.

[59] This has been a continuing concern of many humanists, since the time of Marx, at least.

[60] Greene, op. cit.

[61] Maurice Merleau-Ponty, "The Phenomenology of Perception" Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. 1962.

[62] Mao-Tse-Tung, "On Contradictions" in Selected Readings from the Work of Mao-Tse-Tung Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1971 p. 73.

[63] The placing of the activities of the S.D.S. within the framework of an Integrated Code by Bernstein op. cit. p. 59. is clearly wrong. As Habermas comments:

> What is in question is not the system's productivity and efficiency but rather the way in which the system's achievements have taken on their own life and become independent of the needs of the people who live in it.

Jurgen J.Habermas "Student Protest in the Federal Republic of Germany" in J.J.Habermas, Toward a Rational Society Beacon Press 1970.

[64] Bernstein, op. cit. p. 59.

[65] e.g. Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed
Greene, op. cit.
Paul Goodman, Growing Up Absurd

[66] I include the countries of eastern Europe as well as the so-called free enterprise economies. The problem in eastern European states may well be worse than elsewhere for here bourgeois elites have armed themselves with the ultimate ideological weapon, the very denial, by definition, that they exist.

[67] For instance, Bernstein has pointed out the problems that an excessive emphasis on verbal articulateness and written language, from an early age, place on working class children.

[68] A.V.Cicourel and I.Kitsuse, The Educational Decision Makers is a classic example of how teachers and counsellors, as members or aspiring members of dominant elite groups "unconsciously" perform this function.

[69] As suggested by Bernstein himself in Basil

Bernstein, Class, Codes and Control Volume I Paladin 1973, and Nell Keddie, "Classroom Knowledge" pp. 133-60, in Young op. cit.

[70] Ibid. Nell Keddie pp. 143-55.

CHAPTER III

EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE CODES AND CURRICULUM, PEDAGOGY AND EVALUATION

Introduction

In this chapter, I want to bring together and clearly delineate the position that each code takes over the nature and role of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation in the fromation of educational realities. In my use of the three categories, curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation, I shall follow Bernstein who writes:

> Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as valid realization of this knowledge on the part of the taught.[1]

I shall also, like Bernstein, use knowledge in the widest sense of knowledge as content, process and understanding.

At the same time it must be borne in mind that underlying each code is a particular model of man which, it is hoped, will be the end product of education systems based on such a code. Thus for the Collection Code the model is of "submissive but inflexible man";[2] for the Integrated Code the model is of "conforming but flexible man";[3] for the Emancipatory Code the model is of "controlling, creative and reflexive man".

Curriculum

Curriculum under a Collection Code consists of a rigidly defined area of separate educational knowledge which has developed its own set of ontological truths and understandings and its own methodological techniques and processes; which bear very little relationship to the everyday realities of the learner. Thus for the majority of learners the curriculum consists of various, largely unrelated, areas of educational knowledge each with their mystical and pseudo-religious initiation ceremonies. There will be an emphasis on the achievement of states of knowledge, and on what Kuhn has called "puzzle solving",[4] at more advanced levels. There has been a tendency to extend an elementary form of this "puzzle solving" below the university level in recent years[5] and curriculum theorists have alsc emphasised the importance of an introduction to similar activities at an early age.[6] But in all this the teacher remains a "middle man" whose role in merely to pass on the prior structures and understandings of the discipline. As such, therefore, the curriculum under a Collecticn Code is the reification of the academically structured realities of societal knowledge.

Under an Integrated Code the curriculum consists of teacher defined areas of educational knowledge. However each teacher will be constrained by the need to provide some continuity of ideological position for the learner as he proceeds through his educational career; by the implicit pre-understanding that knowledge is inherently neutral and that there is a unitary scientific method based on rationality; and by the perceived desire that this knowledge be instrumental in terms of the learner's own life world. The need for continuity of ideological position is important since, through the failure to recognise the role that self and class interest play in the selection of what is valid knowledge and how that knowledge shall be used, teachers have to adhere to similar ideological positions otherwise they will obtain different answers despite using a similar methodology.

Here I disagree with Bernstein's suggestion that order can only be achieved under an Integrated Code where "its ideology is explicit, elaborated and closed".[7] While this might apply in relation to pedagogy, the curriculum content is determined on the grounds of covert pre-understandings about what is valid knowledge based on ideological class interests. Thus, not only the family class position but also the socialisation into bourgeois understandings about the world in which they live, achieved through their own educational experience, are important factors in the establishment of the "taken for granted"[8] world of the teacher.

The failure of teachers to be reflexive about their own life world leads them to view the learner's world merely in terms of their own perspectives of that world; so that the curriculum becomes a reification of teachers' objectified interpretations of the learner's "life world" and of the instrumental needs to live in that world.

Under an Emancipatory Code the curriculum will contain no set content but will exercise some control by laying out the direction which any curriculum, for the learner, should take and by suggesting a methodology to be used.

The curriculum will begin by examining the contradictions implicit in the immediate personal "taken for granted" life-world of the learner, normally peer group, family and institutions of work in advanced industrial societies. From there it will expand outwards to examine the "taken for granted" relationships of the learner's social groups with the society of which they are a part; the relationships of that society with the group of societies to which it belongs e.g. the advanced industrial states; and the relationship of that group of societies to the world as a whole. In this manner the learner gains an increased awareness of his role and position as an individual born into and living in a social group, and the role and position of the social groups of which he is a part in a larger world context.

However, the Emancipatory Code is not merely concerned with increased understanding of the "deep structures"[9] of everyday life; but is also concerned with the use of such knowledge to form "helical synergies"[10] of individual and social group interest round the notion of radical praxis. Thus, through reflexive thought, learners become aware of the implicit understandings and deep structures of their social world and devise means, through the notion of praxis, to act upon that world and produce change both in their own individual world and in the social worlds of which they are a part.

Lastly, in this discussion of the curriculum I should add that I have been mainly concerned here with what Jackson has called the "open curriculum" and what Bernstein has called the "instrumental curriculum".[11] In fact the differentiation which both authors make between open/hidden and instrumental/expressive curriculum is really only true for the Collection Code form of curriculum. Under both Integrated and Emancipatory Codes the two forms of curriculum merge into one.

Pedagogy

There are clear differences, under the three codes, not only in the pedagogy and pedagogical relationships, but also in the relative importance of pedagogy itself. In this sense, then, the greater freedom of pedagogical action for the teacher, which Bernstein suggests may exist under

Collection Codes than under Integrated Codes, is a reflection of the relative unimportance of pedagogy, given the strong classification of curriculum knowledge. However, as Bernstein implies,[12] the weakening of the forms of classification under Integrated Codes increase the importance of the teacher, not only as a selector of valid knowledge, but also as a transmitter of that valid knowledge. Similarly, under Emancipatory Codes, although the importance of the teacher's role in deciding curriculum content is greatly diminished, his role in the pedagogical process increases in importance. At the same time, it must be remarked, as I hope to indicate, that the role of the teacher under Collection Codes is radically different to that under either Integrated or Emancipatory Codes.

Under Collection Codes pedagogy is discussed in terms of the transmission of prior structures of educational knowledge, where the teacher is essentially an agent of the discipline he represents. As such his pedagogical role is confined to finding ways of transmitting pre-determined educational realities to learners, over which he exercises little or no control. Thus the teacher can be seen as both an ignorant receiver of knowledge, in terms of his discipline, and an expert giver of knowledge, in terms of his learners.

The learner under Collection Codes is defined in terms of what Esland calls a psychometric model of learning.[13] As such he is seen,

> as a deficit system; a passive object to be progressively initiated into the public thought forms which exist outside him as massive, coercive facticities. . . (thus) the "good pupil" is docile and deferential,[14]

and the relationship between teacher and learner is a strongly hierarchical one. Yet, at the same time, motivation is viewed solely in terms of the learner and the "good" teacher tends to be judged according to his ability to establish means of social control which enhance his power to subjugate his learners. However, the higher up the ladder of the discipline the learner progresses the less servile becomes the nature of the pedagogical relationship, and the larger becomes the area of knowledge within the discipline which the learner may treat as problematic. We therefore have the anomoly, analogous to many religions, that the more elitist the group you belong to the more equalitarian the pedagogical relationship, and the greater the area of knowledge which becomes problematic, within, of course, the ontological realities of the discipline. Thus the role of the teacher is essentially that of an initiator into the methodology and knowledge associated with the discipline and the role of the learner is to learn the correct responses for the various initiating ceremonies.

Under Integrated Codes pedagogy is discussed in terms of teacher selected knowledge and understandings. However, unlike forms of Collection Codes, there is likely to be considerable integration of curriculum and pedagogy. Thus certain forms of educational knowledge are likely to be selected because they can be transmitted by means of certain "valid" pedagogical techniques and vice versa. This reflects the decreased importance of the curriculum in education and the increased importance of the learner as an active being, forming "a dialectical relationship between consciousness and socially approved, socially distributed knowledge",[15] under Integrated Codes. But it must be remembered that the failure of teachers to recognise their reliance upon theorists of bourgeois human development such as Piaget, Bruner and Kohlberg[16] produce what Habermas has called "distorted communications";[17] and so a reification of the teacher's world view at the expense of the learner's.

The teacher's role is therefore manipulative in a pedagogy where he becomes a creator of learning situations in which problem solving by the learner is founded on the use of rational thinking under conditions of increased choice for the learner, which are circumscribed by teacher defined limits of what is valid knowledge.

This attempt to tailor the curriculum and pedagogy to the teacher perceived personal needs of the learner leads to a sense of personal commitment on the part of the teacher in the pedagogical relationship which he hopes to find reciprocated by the learner. In fact there does appear to be some evidence in English Primary Schools which suggests that, where there is this sense of personal commitment on the part of the teacher, many working class children will respond with a personal commitment of their own. Unfortunately, unlike bourgeois children who merely have to, by and large, expand and develop understandings gained in the family setting, working class children have to learn totally new understandings which are never clearly explicated to them and which bear little relationship to their previous life experiences.[18] Bernstein has made this point in relation to linguistic codes and school situations.[19]

Such children are often referred to and summed up in that slightly contemptuous and odious phrase "tries hard". They, of course, seldom overcome the great disadvantages that they have; and so, in a learning situation of apparent equality, are clearly seen, by themselves and their peers, to be inferior in ability to their bourgeois counterparts.

The role of the successful learner in the pedagogical relationship, therefore, involves both a willingness to identify with the teacher at an inter-personal level, often including for older learners a personal friendship on terms of apparent equality, while implicitly recognising the teacher's ultimate right, given by his social position, to control and determine the nature of the curriculum. As Keddie has shown, the "good" pupil has similar understandings about the social world as those of the teacher due to their similar class backgrounds; so that he is able to make the correct, teacher defined responses, and has his abilities over-rated.[20] For the working class learner, coming from a fundamentally different social world, such responses are incorrect, if not nonsensical; and so his abilities are consistently under-rated.[21]

This is ultimately the result of the failure of the teacher to come to terms with the deep structure of either his own world or that of the learner. Bernstein has remarked:

> If the culture of the teacher is to become part of the consciousness of the child, then the culture of the child must first be in the consciousness of the teacher".[22]

This is the pre-requisite for any form of pedagogical relationship under Emancipatory Codes.

There is again an integration of curriculum and pedagogy, as under Integrated Codes; but this synthesis is not centred round the unreflexive world of the teacher; it is, rather, centred round a prior synthesis of the worlds of the teacher and learner.

Pedagogy under Emancipatory Codes is both dialogical and dialectical, and involves, for the teacher, roles which are both delicate and difficult. One of the problems for the teacher is that, although in the initial stages of the learning process he exercises considerable control over the pedagogical situation through his problem posing questions concerning the immediate exestential realities of the learner's world, increasingly his role becomes subservient to the learner's role; until they form a synthesis where teacher is learner/teacher and learner, teacher/learner.

There are, then, during the actual learning process, considerable changes in the nature of the pedagogical relationship, and part of the teacher's role is to actually facilitate his own loss of power in the traditional sense that it is attributed to the teacher; so that it can be used by the learning group and individuals therein to develop their own sense of direction and control over the learning process of which they are a part. This does not mean that he ceases to be of any importance in the learning process but rather that the learners will utilise the teacher as a resource in the learning process, so that his role is increasingly determined by their self-perceived needs.

This is particularly difficult for the teacher under Emanipatory Codes; because the achievement of the sort of progress by the learners which allows them to take over their own learning may well rely on the initial success of the teacher in such traditional areas of pedagogical expertise as rhetoric, persuasiveness and organisation. Thus he has to convince learners to forego their traditional secure subservience to the teacher and risk the dangers, excitement and insecurity of accepting active control of, and responsibility for, their own learning processes. He has to persuade learners, who have often been in competition with each other for many years, to try cooperating with each other and pooling their understandings and skills. He has to persuade learners that they should try to understand their own strengths and weaknesses and by willing to expose their, and his own, fragile egos to the dangers of debate and argument about their own social realities. He has to provide the emotional support and encouragement, where necessary, for individuals and social groups to overcome the temporary impasses and conflicts which may often seem, in the early days, insurmountable to the learners. He must be able to organise the learning situation in such a way that learners will concentrate on the "deep structures" of their own existential realities without worrying about unresolved problems of administrative and evaluation procedures.

Above all he must, by the power of his rhetoric be able to convey and inspire learners to put forth the time and effort to both become aware of the "painful realities" of their own existence and, through praxis, be willing to act upon their world to change it.

Thus, in the early stages of the pedagogical relationship the teacher exercises considerable control and domination over the learner, which he then relinquishes to the learner as the learning process develops. This is doubly difficult for the teacher because there appears to be a natural aversion, amongst men, to the relinquishing of power which has accrued in human relationships, since it is often viewed as a blow to the ego; and because he may well have to withdraw, to some extent, from the learning situation and allow learners to proceed at their own pace and make their own mistakes. In this sense he may for a time, become a partial "outsider" until the learners develop their own sense of self-reliance, social strength and individual esteem as active creators of their own world to a level where they can meet the teacher on a level of equality, using his strengths to contribute to their synergy.

Concomitant with the decline in power of the teacher in the pedagogical relationship, then, there is a rise in the power of the learner, a power based on an increasing ability to examine praxiologically the deep structures of his existential world and expand them to include larger and larger totalities. Clearly though, from the outset, the learner has considerable responsibilities which he must be willing to undertake. Firstly, he must overcome his fear of freedom and his, often held, conviction that he is powerless in face of the over-riding power of "society" or the "powers that be". In this sense he must overcome his mystical view of the world. Secondly, and this is particularly difficult for so-called successful bourgeois members of society, he must overcome an aversion to the notion of cooperative endeavour with, and reliance on, other men to seek both collective and individual understanding and control over social realities. Thirdly, he must realise that, under Emancipatory Codes, education becomes merged into everyday life and the learning process continues until death. As Mao has remarked "contradiction exists universally and in all processes".[23] Fourthly, he must accept that the struggle for most men to regain control of their societal institutions, and so emancipate themselves sociologically as well as psychologically, will be a long one which is only likely to meet with limited success in our life-times. One of his tasks as a learner is therefore to decide upon a list of praxiological priorities based on his perception of the practicalities of the current social situation.

Therefore the pedagogical relationships like the pedagogy, under Emancipatory Codes will be in a continuing state of flux according to the self interpreted needs of the learners.

Evaluation

Evaluation under Collection Codes, while testing the willingness and ability of the learner to come to terms with the objectified realities of the discipline, also serves a "gatekeeping" function in terms of both the discipline itself and the larger society.

In testing the willingness and ability of the learner to come to terms with the prior structured realities of the discipline, the learner may be tested on his ability to regurgitate the knowledge content considered valid at the various levels of initiation into the discipline, and/or he may be required to demonstrate his ability to use knowledge content in puzzle-solving within the framework of the discipline.

These evaluations are concerned with mainly cognitive attributes, as defined by the discipline, and so retain an impersonal aspect.

However these evaluations also serve a gatekeeping function in a competitive situation. Thus they are used as a means of regulating progress towards, and entry into, the elite group within any discipline, according to the availability of places at any one time amongst that group. Standards tend to become more rigorous at all levels of evaluation, e.g. over the last five years entrance standards for Mathematics in English universities have risen to the extent that students now require a level of knowledge for entry to university similar to that expected of students at the end of the first year of university five years ago. One might also point to the increasing necessity for a Ph.D. as a pre-requisite for university teaching all over the world. Also these evaluations are used as a means of achieving entry into elite institutions, educational and otherwise, and through them to elite groups in society.

But, it must be pointed out that evaluation in terms of the "hidden curriculum" or expressive area of the educational situation is also important, although this is kept separate and there is still the prior necessity to obtain "success" in terms of the open curriculum. It is possible for the learner who achieves a very high level of success in terms of the "open curriculum" to overcome adverse evaluations in terms of the "hidden curriculum" and gain entry into elite institutions and groups, despite such adverse evaluations.

The means normally chosen to evaluate learners is some form of examination or test. As such we can see these examinations representing a form of initiating ceremony which heralds the end of an apprenticeship at one level of the discipline and a worthiness to proceed to the next level.

Evaluation under Integrated Codes is viewed in terms of the capacity of the learner to use instrumental rational thinking in problem solving situations to produce solutions which coincide with those of the teacher. As such evaluation therefore tests the extent to which the learner is able and willing to enter the learning world of the teacher, and how well he has absorbed the ideology of the elite group of which the teacher is a fringe member. In short, it is a test of the capacity of learners to comprehend and conform to teacher defined social realities as the starting point for the learning process.

Since the curriculum under Integrated Codes is a synthesis of previous separate "open"and "closed" components, evaluation involves a synthesis of th "instrumental" and "expressive" dimensions of the educational situation; and so a synthesis of the cognitive and dispositional attributes of the learner. Thus the learner must demonstrate, not only certain cognitive attributes, but also an enthusiasm for, and identification with, the teacher to be successful.

At the same time evaluation will remain a means of determining entry into elite groups and elite educational institutions, and will continue to ensure the fundamental structures and positions of such elite groups and institutions, because aspiring members will be required to demonstrate that they share similar ideological positions and understandings about the nature of social reality. The successful learner in such a situation may well have to take the role of the sycophant. This is certainly the implication of Keddie's research.[24]

However, while evaluation under Integrated Codes serve the similar purpose of institutional and societal validation, its method of evaluation will be rather different. Rather than an emphasis on examinations in the form of initiation tests, there will be emphasis on continuous assessment of the learner's work as the means of evaluation. This is partly because the recognition of the learner as an active creator, rather than a passive respondent, requires that the teacher monitor closely the activities of the learner to ensure that his creativity is channelled into to the "right" direction; partly because curriculum under Integrated Codes places much greater emphasis on the learning process as such, rather than merely the results of that learning process, and evaluation must take cognisance of this fact.

Evaluation under Integrated Codes is much more complex and difficult than under Collection Codes, since it calls for an assessment by the teacher which takes account of a synthesised form of cognitive and dispositional attributes measured in terms of ways of knowing rather than states of knowledge.

Evaluation under Emancipatory Codes is viewed in terms of the utility of the learning experience to the various individual members of the learning group and to the learning group as a whole. It is assessed therefore by dialogical and dialectical means and becomes a part of the pedagogy and curriculum, so that the three become synthesised into one totality. As such it is the praxis of reflexivity and involves a consideration of the role of each individual learner, a consideration of the role of the teacher; and a consideration of the methodologies chosen and rejected during the problem-solving process. But as well as this, it also involves a consideration of the nature and worth of the problem which has been solved, or perhaps has not been solved, and its place in the current existential realities of the learners.

However, while evaluation, as under Integrated Codes, is continuous, it will not be continual. Thus the evaluation of the nature and worth of a problem which the group is currently attempting to solve, will normally be held in abeyance until some natural end point has been reached; so that all the energies and capacities of the learners can be concentrated on the solution of the problem. If this does not happen there may well develop a tendency for learners to avoid difficulties in the learning process by deciding that the problem was not worth solving anyway; and this in turn may lead to the selection of problems, not because of their validity, but because they appear easy to solve. It is very important, therefore, that there be serious and detailed evaluation of the problem, its nature and validity, before the learners attempt to solve it. Evaluation then, under Emancipatory Codes, takes place both before and after "the fact", rather than during it. Only if this is done will learners learn to overcome initial setbacks and discouragement to develop the mental stamina necessary for the solution of most of the problems which they face.

Clearly evaluation under Emancipatory Codes is not concerned with societal validation for entry into elite groups or educational institutions, but instead is concerned with the validity of the learning experience to the learner. In this sense it is very different from evaluation under Integrated or Collection Codes because it represents a judgement of the extent to which curriculum and pedagogy have entered the world of the learner; and, therefore, where a teacher still exercises some control over curriculum and pedagogy, a judgement of him as a teacher; rather than a judgement by the teacher of the learner. Although, of course, the learner must also simultaneously judge his own role.

The means of evaluation under Emancipatory Codes does represent serious problems for any form of its implementation under current educational situations, where evaluation is normally through some form of grading system. The use of such grading systems by learners to grade themselves for external validation is a prostitution of the nature of evaluation under Emancipatory Codes. However, a general move towards a credit/non-credit system, where virtually everyone obtained a credit; to be found in, amongst other places, English teacher training establishments and graduate schools; would allow such evaluation for external validation, for all intents and purposes, to be ignored.

Summary

In this chapter I have tried to clearly delineate some of the differences between the three codes in terms of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. There may be problems in differentiating Integrated and Emancipatory Codes during the early stages of their development, under certain situations. For instance, where teachers are working in an educational institution which draws its learners entirely from bourgeois groups, it is quite possible that the teachers and learners may well have a congruence of viewpoint in many matters, due to similar class interests. However if one examines the situation for any length of time then it will become apparent, under Integrated Codes, that dialogue, dialectic and praxis are only used within the framework of a non-reflexive, and ultimately teacher controlled, situation. Thus, the deep structures of the "taken for granted" world remain impermeable to learner and teacher.

Another way in which Integrated and Emancipatory Codes can be differentiated is by examining the relationship between curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Under Collection Codes the three are treated as discrete entities in which curriculum and evaluation are regarded as the most important factors in the educational situation. Under Integrated Codes a form of synthesis takes place between curriculum and pedagogy, but evaluation remains a separate entity, and continues to be under the control of the teacher, although the teacher may well ask for the views of the learner concerning curriculum and pedagogy. Also evaluation is still carried out for external validation under Integrated Codes, for entry into elite groups and elite institutions.

Only under Emancipatory Codes do we find curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation forming a synthesis in which all play a part in the learning experience of the learner. It is, also, only under Emancipatory Codes that we find the nature of the role of teacher and learner in the pedagogical situation undergoing fundamental changes during the learning process.

This is where I shall leave the theoretical aspect of the thesis and go on to consider its application in empirical educational situations which I investigated.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Basil Bernstein, "On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge" in Knowledge and Control ed. by M.F.D.Young, Collier MacMillan 1971 p. 47

[2] Ibid. p. 67

[3] Ibid. P. 67 Although Bernstein suggests that a move to Integrated Codes may reflect a crisis in the basic classification and frames of society, in the conditions he lays down for the successful implementation of Integrated Codes he is clearly seeing the ideal learner product as "conforming but flexible".

[4] Thomas S.Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions University of Chicago Press revised edition 1970 pp. 35-43

[5] e.g. the Nuffield Science Secondary School courses developed in England.

[6] J.J.Schwab, "Biological Sciences Curriculum Study" in The Biology Teachers' Handbook ed. by J.J.Schwab, Wiley 1965.

[7] Bernstein, op.cit. p. 66

[8] As used by Alfred Schutz to refer to the "sediments of meaning and. . .the intentionalities of the perspectives of relevance and the horizons of interest". c/f Alfred Schutz, Collected Papers Volume I p. 136

[9] Deep structures refers to the "taken for granted" assumptions about relevances, priorities etc. See above footnote [8]

[10] I take the term helical synergy from the work of Hampden-Turner. He uses the term to refer to the ongoing social relationships between individuals and social groups. He argues that such relationships can be viewed in terms of a double helix where "with continual revolutions of the intersecting cycles it is possible for perceptions to be improved, identities strengthened and invested competencies to be confirmed". Charles Hampden-Turner, Radical Man Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co, 1971 p. 38
It is during this process that synergy develops, a synergy which
"grows out of a dialectical and dialogical process of balance, justice and equality, between persons or groups and between the ideas and resources they represent; such SYNERGY always exists on multiple levels. . .(and represents). . .the fusion between different humane aims and resources to

create MORE between the interacting parties than they had prior to the interaction".
Charles Hampden-Turner, From Poverty to Dignity Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co. 1975 pp.32-7

[11] The "open" or "instrumental" dimension of the curriculum refers to the actual subject matter used in the classroom situation. The "closed"or "expressive" dimension of the curriculum refers to the socialisation role of the educational institution carried on through its rules and understandings governing social relationships.
c/f P.W.Jackson, Life in the Classroom Holt, Rinehart and Winston 1968 and Basil Bernstein, "Sources of Consensus and Disaffection in Education", in Open University Course Unit 5 (Educational Studies E283) Open University Press 1972.

[12] Bernstein op. cit. p. 65

[13] Geoffrey M.Esland, "Teaching and Learning as the Organization of Knowledge" in Young op. cit. p. 88

[14] Ibid. p. 89

[15] Ibid. p. 94

[16] Piaget's early work is a brilliant analysis of the developmental process of bourgeois children, but we need similar analyses of the developmental process of working class children. The work of Bruner and Kohlberg, building to a large extent on the work of Piaget, shows how understandings obtained through the unreflexive examination of bourgeois children are translated into universal standards of child development and human behaviour - an interesting example of the suggestion by Marx that the ideas of the ruling class become the ruling ideas.

[17] Jurgen J.Habermas, "Toward a Theory of Communicative Competence" in Recent Sociology Number 2 ed. by H.P.Dreitzel, Collier-MacMillan Ltd. 1970. This refers to the assumptions of what Schutz calls a "reciprocity of perspectives" based on similar understandings developed in the "taken for granted" world. When communication is "distorted" it is because such an assumption is invalid due to the differences in the "taken for granted" worlds of the communicants.

[18] I have, both as a teacher and as an observer of student teachers, seen this happen without, at the time, understanding exactly what was happening.

[19] Basil Bernstein, "A Critique of the Concept of Compensatory Education", in Basil Bernstein, Class, Codes and Control Volume I, Paladin, Granada Pub. Ltd. 1973.

[20] Nell Keddie, "Classroom Knowledge" in Knowledge and Control ed. M.F.D.Young op. cit.

[21] Ibid., also E.J.Goodacre, Teachers and Their Pupils' Home Background National Foundation for Educational Research, 1968 and Howard S.Becker, "Social Class Variations in Teacher-Pupil Relationships" in Journal of Educational Sociology volume 25 1952.

[22] Bernstein, "A Critique of Compensatory Education" 1973 op. cit. p. 225

[23] Mao-Tse-Tung, "On Contradictions" in Selected Readings from the Work of Mao-Tse-Tung Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1971 p. 73

[24] Nell Keddie, "Classroom Knowledge" in Young op. cit.

CHAPTER IV

THE PROFESSOR AS CURRICULUM DEVELOPER

Introduction : The Empirical Situation

The empirical data for this study was collected during the course of the first and second semesters of the 1974-5 winter term in a large western Canadian University.

The influence of the U.S.A. upon this university, politically, intellectually, structurally and administratively has been very great. This influence has been exercised directly through the large numbers of American professors employed in the university, and through their formal and informal links with the U.S.A.; and through a widespread reliance upon American intellectual ideas and textbooks. This influence is particularly strong in the Faculty of Education but has a pervasive influence in all Faculties, and the organisation of learning in undergraduate education clearly reflects this influence.

To obtain a first degree students take a large number of mainly, one semester courses covering largely disparate, as they are treated, educational knowledge areas, with very little attempt to provide an underlying rationale or framework within which these separate knowledge areas can be seen as part of a cohesive whole. Many of these courses, especially first and second year ones which are termed junior level, are taught by formal lecture techniques to large classes of between thirty and one hundred, or more, students. In these courses personal contact between instructor and student is minimal and students at least feel there is a concentration on learning of knowledge content, of attaining states of knowledge[1] which are then tested mainly by examination.

Thus this university, in the organisation of its undergraduate education, represents many features of the classic North American course based Collection Code situation: the treatment of educational knowledge in each course as a separate entity, an emphasis on the attainment of states of knowledge; and a separation of educational and community knowledge.[2] However, additionally, students and instructors place great importance on what Becker et al have called the "grade point average perspective",[3] which is again particularly prevalent in North America.

The subject of my study was three sections of a junior level introductory education course in the Department of Educational Foundations, which is itself a part of the Faculty of Education.

The Reorganisation of the Introductory Education Course in the Educational Foundations Department

For the academic year 1974-5 the Department of Educational Foundations had decided to introduce a new system for the organisation of the teaching of their junior level introductory half-credit course. This course is generally regarded as compulsory by students in the Faculty of Education,[4] and so attracts large numbers of students each year.

Under the system in operation prior to 1974-5 the various sections of the course were taught by a mixture of Graduate Teaching Assistants (G.T.A.) and professors, each of whom had sole control over what was done in the classroom situation. In terms of curriculum this meant that each teacher tended to concentrate on what he considered to be the more important facets of education, with no regard for what anyone else was doing. To establish at least a limited amount of curriculum conformity, and to ensure at least the semblance of professorial control over every classroom situation; the teaching of this introductory course was reorganised for the two terms of the winter semester of 1974-5. The G.T.A.s[5] teaching the course were allocated to various senior professors in the Department, generally in the ratio of three G.T.A.s to one professor. However, no stipulations were laid down as to the extent of the control which the professor should exercise over the curriculum, pedagogy or means of evaluation that the G.T.A.s would use; and in practice it varied considerably.

It was not intended that the professors be involved in the teaching of a section as such; so the sections were allocated to G.T.A.s only,[6] and no restrictions in the form of curriculum or other requirements were enunciated, apart from University regulations governing Undergraduate courses,cf course.

It may well seem strange to the reader that there has been little attempt to formulate a common curriculum for the only introductory course which the department offers, and to understand why this is so it is necessary to say a little about the department as such.

The Department of Educational Foundations was a creation of administrative convenience, rather than an attempt to integrate what was conceived as the core areas of educational knowledge that make up the multi-discipline of education. It is significant, for instance, that neither educational psychology nor educational administration are represented as sub-areas within the department but have separate departments of their own. In short the department is home for a number of sub-areas of educational study which were not large enough to achieve a separate departmental status.

There are three major sub-areas of specialisation within the department: the history of education, the philosophy of education and the sociology of education. The vast majority of the members of each of these sub-areas regards their area as a discrete and autonomous entity which has a stronger allegiance to the respective disciplines of history, philosophy and sociology than a subject area termed educational foundations. It is interesting to note in this regard that, while some other departments in the Faculty of Education are willing to allow a professor in this department to act as chairman of a thesis committee, within the department students may only select chairmen of their committees from their own sub-area of specialisation. An interesting example of the way in which the strong classification in the sub-areas clearly delineated student choice in terms of the legitimacy of the professor as an initiated member of that sub-area. This rigid compartmentalisation of educational knowledge in terms of these three specialisations has created problems for newer areas of specialisation which have been created in the department, such as the anthropology of education, comparative and international perspectives on education and intercultural education. Until now they have tended to be peripheral to the major interests of the department and have formed parasitic relationships with the major areas of specialisation.

We can see, then, the department operating broadly within a Collection Code framework that is both course-based and discipline-based in terms of the sub-areas of the department.

Given this sort of orientation in the department it is not surprising to find that, apart from this one introductory course, each sub-area only offers courses in its own area of speciality, so that there are virtually no other courses in the department which even purport to be cross-disciplinary. As one might expect in this situation, prior to 1974-5, each section teacher of this introductory course had emphasised strongly certain aspects of his own sub-area perspective in the teaching of this course.

The changes in the organisation of this course for the 1974-5 academic year were an attempt to change this essentially individualistic Collection Code situation by achieving some degree of commonality across at least three sections of the course. However, there were no indications that the professors would not follow their own individual interests in formulating curriculum with their respective G.T.A.s or sessional lecturers. In this regard the choice which professors could exercise over the G.T.A.s they wished to work with them and the professor's own academic training as specialists in the various sub-areas of the department, increased the likelihood of sub-area differentiation of curriculum according to professorial specialisation.

In terms of educational knowledge codes there existed, prior to the 1974-5 academic year, a fairly typical course-based North American university Collection Code situation where each teacher exercised a large degree of autonomy over what he did, within the interpretative structures of his discipline area.

There were certain anomolies in the situation which made it slightly different from the typical one though. Firstly G.T.A.s were given complete autonomy in the teaching situation; secondly, the discipline of the G.T.A.s was an applied discipline rather than a pure one and, coming, for the most part, from the relatively weak discipline orientation of a North American first degree; they would be more likely to consider utilising ideas from several disciplines than would the professors who were acknowledged experts in one area of specialisation. Thirdly, because of the various applied discipline areas existing in the Educational Foundations Department, the general junior level introductory course knowledge content reflected these different discipline area approaches to education; and fourthly, the description of the course and nature of the department provided the possibility of going far beyond the normal restrictions of a discipline based course. It is interesting that, in this regard, those students in the three sections I investigated who had heard anything about the possible subject matter of the course, for the large part, expected either a course centred round the history or philosophy of education. This may be mere chance, but it could also indicate that this course was taught in the years immediately prior to 1974-5, by people from those two sub-areas of the department.

The reorganisation for the 1974-5 academic year opened up possibilities for the professors, as curriculum developers, which is essentially the role which they were given, to experiment with new forms of organisation and structure which might lead to a form of Integrated Code, or even Emancipatory Code, as well as the traditional Collection Code. In this regard the description of the course as an "Introductory Course in Education" and the amorphous nature of that discipline, if that is the correct word to use of such a problematically defined area of study, provides much greater flexibility in terms of curriculum than even such courses in sociology and psychology, let alone physics or chemistry; although it also leaves unresolved the continuing conflict between the treatment of education as an academic discipline per se and the treatment of education as the professional preparation of teachers for the school situation. That is not to suggest that such options were not available under the old system, but rather to imply that the casting of professors in the role of curriculum developers gave them an enhanced responsibility for the courses under their jurisdiction, and the time to think about overall course strategies and structures rather than the minutiae of content and pedagogy.

One professor in the department determined to use this opportunity to develop, with the three G.T.A.s under his supervision, an innovatory educational programme based, partly, on the educational philosophy of Paulo Freire.[7]

The professor had already tried out some of the ideas he wished to incorporate into this programme during the previous year, when he had taken over a similar undergraduate course from a G.T.A. who had left.

The professor had carefully chosen his G.T.A.s so that they had already taken some courses with him as an instructor, and were, he felt, sympathetic to an innovative programme of the sort which he had in mind. Unfortunately, one of the G.T.A.s did not return to university;and so the professor had to accept an allocated replacement who was a new member of the department.

However, before I go on to consider the biographical background of the professor and his actual role as a curriculum developer, I want to examine the characteristics of ideal typifications of the roles of curriculum developers under the three educational knowledge codes I have set up.

The Role of the Curriculum Developer under the Three Educational Knowledge Codes.

The role of the curriculum developer under Collection Codes is to lay down, within the knowledge framework of the discipline, the relevant knowledge content of the curriculum applicable to the type of educational institution and so-called "abilities" of the learners; and to lay down the means of evaluation and the level of attainment expected of the learner for him to have been deemed successful in the examination, and so ready to move on to the next level. Thus the curriculum developer exercises a controlling influence over both the nature of the curriculum and the means and level of evaluation1 In such cases as the English 'O' and 'A' level G.C.E. examinations the curriculum developer determines the nature of the curriculum and actually determines both the questions which shall be asked in the examination situation and the acceptability of the answers in terms of both their standard and their content.

At the university level, however, the role of the curriculum developer is usually severely curtailed as each university teacher, working within the broad framework of the discipline, or course, exercises considerable autonomy over curriculum, and some autonomy over the means and standard of evaluation; although senior teachers within the discipline, and the controlling interest group within the university, may exercise considerable control over the means and standard of evaluation. Here the generally stronger Collection Codes in British universities lead to greater restrictions on the freedom of action of individual university teachers to control curriculum and evaluation; than in many comparative North American institutions. This enhanced power is a reflection of the relative positions of the university teacher who is, in a sense, the "high priest" of Collection Codes; and so is allowed to exercise considerably more control over the educational situation than "lesser mortals", and be given much more freedom.

However, the position of G.T.A.s teaching in North American universities is something of an anomoly, because they have not been formally initiated into the final rites of their discipline. Therefore, even where they are given courses to teach, it is quite likely that there will be a professor acting as a supervisor and curriculum developer in a fairly traditional way.[8]

It is not necessary that the curriculum developer be a figure separate from teachers under Integrated Codes, and in fact often teachers will carry out this role as a part of their functioning as teachers. The role of the curriculum developer is, initially, to establish explicit educational principles concerning the nature of education, and the role of teacher and learner in the pedagogical relationship, founded on implicit ideological understandings about the social world. These educational principles are then used to determine both what is valid curriculum and pedagogy, with both forming a kind of synthesis where curriculum is often justified partly because of the pedagogical options it provides and vice versa.

During this process new teachers are socialised into "the interpretative procedures of the code so that these become implicit guides which regulate and co-ordinate the behaviour of the individual teachers".[9] This role does not have to be carried actually in the school situation and for instance,primary school student teachers in English Colleges of Education are socialised into the code through their professional training courses and through their concurrent theory courses in educationl In this situation, then, both lecturers in education and in the areas of professional training, often the same people, are taking the role of curriculum developers.

However, the curriculum developer must also help in determining both the manner of evaluation and the level which will be regarded as successful. But, as with curriculum and pedagogy, this does not mean the laying down of specific rules; but rather reaching a common understanding between the teachers involved, and establishing a monitoring service within the educational institution to obtain reports from teachers regarding the relative success or failure of various forms of evaluation. This is part of the continuing role of the curriculum developer during the learning process, where he acts as a conciliator and negotiator, ensuring the smooth operation of co-operative mechanisms between teachers; whilst providing both emotional and resource support for individual teachers.

One might ask how this view of the curriculum developer squares with the semi-autonomous role envisaged for the teacher in Chapter II. However, it should be borne in mind that the teacher defined situation is always qualified by the consensual framework established within a particular educational institution, or various educational institutions, and the prior understandings brought to the situation by previous professional training and other experience.

The role of the curriculum developer under Emancipatory Codes is, like that under Integrated Codes, socialising teachers into the "interpretative procedures of the code so that these become implicit guides which regulate and co-ordinate the behaviour of the individual teachers".[10] However, since these interpretative procedures are considerably different under the two codes the role of the curriculum developer also differs markedly.

Under Emancipatory Codes the curriculum developer must bring together the teachers involved in specific educational situations or institutions and form them into a task force to closely examine the life world of their potential learners.

It is during this process that the teachers learn the methodology of dialectic and dialogue to isolate the "deep structure", or Husserlian "essences" of the learners' and their own life worlds. Thus through examining the learners'world they learn to examine and question their own, and so free their minds from the ideological chains which bind them. They develop both as a social group and as individuals their own synergy.

During this process the role of the curriculum developer is very much that of the teacher in the pedagogical relationship with the students. Initially exercising considerable control over the learning situation of the teachers, which he gradually relinquishes until the teachers have taken total control. It is important that the curriculum developer pose problems in such a way that the teachers become aware of the need to view curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation as parts of a synthetic whole which increasingly develops its rationale through the initiative of the learners. Similarly, through his own praxiology, he must point the way for teachers also to progressively relinquish their power to their own learners.

It is vitally important that the curriculum developer also persuade the teachers of the need for, initially, relatively rigid structuring of the learning situation. This is necessary for three reasons; firstly, to ensure that the learners can derive a sense of security from the structure and organisation of the learning situation to offset the insecurity of having to examine and question the fundamental frameworks of their world by means of dialogue and dialectic; secondly, because there will also be an increased sense of security from the sense of purpose and direction which the teacher will find much easier to provide in such situations; thirdly, because it allows the learners to concentrate all their energies on the one matter in hand; and fourthly because the learners discover the importance, from the beginning, of concentrating their energies on particular problems, rather than attempting to take in and solve a large number at once. The role of the curriculum developer during the actual learning process will be a minor one, although learning groups may wish to make use of his expertise in certain areas. However, it is important that he, like the teacher, should not be used as a final arbiter in such situations, and so remove from the learner his responsibility for his own decision making.

Similarly the curriculum developer may take an active role in the continuing dialogue between teachers, which should take place throughout the learning process, regarding their own particular problems and progress; but this participation should be as an equal and be that of a listener rather than a decision-maker. It must be remembered that an essential part of the learning process, for all concerned, is the breaking down of the traditional hierarchical relationships, and nothing that the curriculum developer does should inhibit this process.

In short, the role of the curriculum developer under Collection Codes is to lay down the structures of curriculum knowledge;and the method and level of evaluation, which he will also supervise.

The role of the curriculum developer under Integrated Codes is to help teachers achieve consensus on the nature of the educational principles they wish to implement, and help them develop curriculum and pedagogy programmes to carry out that implementation; while also aiding in the establishment of suitable means of evaluation.

The role of the curriculum developer under Emancipatory Codes is to organise the initial examination of the learner's and teacher's world; and, during this examination, to practice with them the methodology of dialectic, dialogue and praxis which they, in turn, will practice with their own learners. In a sense then the role of the curriculum developer is not only to develop in teachers an understanding of their learners' worlds; but also to place them in the position that they will place their learners, so that the teachers become learners before they teach.

The Influence of the Professor's Biographical Process as a Contributing Factor to His Philosophy of Education

The professor, who supervised the three sections of the introductory course which I investigated, is in several ways an atypical member of the department.

Of Roumanian birth, he was brought up as a member of a minority Anglo-Jewish community in Montreal. As such he was doubly a member of a minority group as a non-Anglo Jew in an Anglo-Christian majority, and as an English speaker in a French majority speaking province. He has continued his position as a member of a minority group throughout his academic career. He is one of the few genuine polymaths in University life today with an M.A. in Curriculum

Development, a Ph.D. in Philosophy of Education and two periods as a visiting fellow in Anthropology at Cornell University. But, and probably more important for any polymath, he reads voraciously and widely in areas as widely dispersed as cybernetics and Greek history. Added to this, he is a Marxist intellectual in one of the most conservative universities in, by European standards, a very conservative national university establishment;[11] and is one of the very few members of the department interested in developing the notion of a core of common understandings which constitute the foundations of the discipline of education.[12] He does represent many of the features of what Stonequist[13] and Park[14] have called "marginal man" in his personal biography and seems to support Park's suggestion that such a man "becomes relatively to his cultural milieu, the individual with the wider horizon".[15]

The "biographical process" which I have briefly outlined is, I believe, and important factor in the development of the professor's philosophical position concerning education.

Having lived culturally, intellectually and politically as a "marginal man" the professor has had to continually reconcile opposing positions and differing interpretations of reality. To be able to carry on such a process he clearly needed to develop the capacity for reflexivity and also the methodology of the dialectic, combined with the notion that men can understand control and change the social world in which they live. It is likely also that his belief in the importance of dialogue in the educational process arises form the need, in part, for it as a means of explicating ideas and positions different form one's own. At the same time coming out of the Jewish tradition of the "shtetl" he would be well aware of the importance of dealogue and dialectic as a means of establishing individual difference and social cohesiveness, together with the notion of praxis, without which it is highly unlikely that Jewish communities could have survived as long as they have.

There are then elements in the personal background of the professor which influence the way in which he views education and the way in which he conceptualised the course which I investigated, especially his concern for reflexivity, dialectic and dialogue as methodological devices.

The Professor's Conceptualisation of the Course

The professor's conceptualisation of the course under consideration was gained from an interview with him on November 14th 1974, from his comments during discussions between him and the G.T.A.s teaching the course, and from comments he made to students taking the course during lectures he gave to all three sections.

The professor's view of the objectives of education are concerned with the identification of the elements of the past which are still functional in the existential present of the learner and the telescoping of the essential elements of this individual, social and cultural past into a learning experience which allows men to better cope with their existential futures.

To achieve these objectives he suggests the need for methodologies which are dialectical, dialogical and praxiological; so that people recognise that they "create reality by placing a part of their own subjective being into a situation".[16]

These views can be seen as part of an itellectual tradition which follows in the Marxist tradition of Gramsci, the early Lukacs, Habermas and Freire; rather than Lenin, Stalin and Althusser. As such there is a tendency to stress the idealist rather than the materialist forces of social change.

Implicit in the professor's position also, is a belief in the fundamental capacity of man for creativity, social co-operation and "goodness".

The professor's conceptualisations of the course that I investigated are also based on a belief that the role of undergraduate education should be concerned with the development of "broadly based humanistic orientations prior to any professional training".[17] Since this course is a junior level course one would expect him to emphasise the development of a humanistic orientation. He saw the objectives of the course, therefore, in terms of an attempt to integrate theory, practice, politics and values in a synthesis "to produce a concept of education we can exemplify and put into practice in our classrooms".[18] In doing this he argued that one should:

> Develop a frame of reference which can bring to consciousness what they (the learners) have had as a part of their upbringing and consider it in the light of being mature and adult so that they can do something about what they have been conditioned to in the period when they were too young to know what was happening".[19]

Here he is combining the concepts of reflexivity and praxis as essential components of educational situations which stress affective commitment and the notion of education as a coming to terms with and developing the existential realities of the learner's world.

In his perception of the course as a progression from a kind of "ego analysis", in which the learner examines his personal past experiences as influencing factors on his current personality, through the examination of ethnocentric "natural attitudes" on the part of the learner, to the developmemt of "larger ecumenical and humanistic criteria",[20] which allow the learner to place and judge his actions in the context of ideals and realities governing all humanity; the professor hoped to achieve a helical synergy in which learners not only question an increasingly large individual and social totality; but also develop, individually and as a social group, growing self-direction, so that they take increasing control of the pedagogical function.

However, the professor envisaged this happening within certain structural restraints. Thus he suggested that the course should be organised in the form of three one month sections, with the first month devoted to ego-analysis, the second month to ethno-centric "natural attitude" analysis, and the third month to the development of an ecumenical dimension; while movement from one section to the next would be achieved by means of a "dialectical jump so that the level of achievement attained (at one level) becomes incorporated into the next level".[21] At the same time the professor stated that he wanted Skolnick and Skolnick's book "Intimacy, Family and Society"[22] to be used as a common textbook across the three sections and suggested that each G.T.A. read through the book and select articles for group discussion. But he did state that he did not want the book used in the traditional fashion as the set of compulsory readings for the course; rather he wished it to be used as a book for students to read privately and "browse" through, because "a good many of the articles enable people to see themselves in a larger context".[23] As such he hoped the book would be a unifying element for the three sections.[24]

The professor also intended to have an input into the pedagogical situation by himself taking every sixth one hour class with the students of the three sections as a large group. However, exactly what he was going to do, and how this would fit into the G.T.A.s own pedagogical schedule, was never fully discussed.

The professor did not specify any particular pedagogical techniques which should be used, and discussions on the matter never reached any form of consensus about which techniques might be used; but the professor clearly favoured the use of small group situations, with which he had had some success in teaching this course the previous year, and also wanted G.T.A.s to encourage students to meet in small groups outside the formal classroom situation to create the type of "home intimacy not possible in the classroom or university situation".[25] It is a little strange that the professor did not, in the meetings I attended, push more strongly the use of small group situations as a major form of pedagogy, given his own feelings on the matter. Yet he does seem to have assumed that this form of pedagogy would be intensively used; since his response during the interview to the question of what he hoped the least responsive student would gain from the course was that:

> By virtue of having the groups small enough every student will have had to articulate and talk to at least a number of fellow students and. . . this in itself will be more than happens in most classes today.

However this may be because, during discussions prior to the start of the course, pedagogy was never dealt with in a rigorous and concentrated manner.

Perhaps so little time was devoted to pedagogy because so much time was devoted to the question of evaluation, where differences of opinion between G.T.A.s and the professor were never satisfactorily resolved in any form of consensus. The professor, although wanting to retain the university stanine system of grading for evaluation, wished to allow fifty percent of that evaluation to be in the form of self-evaluation by the students, while finding some means of "correlating evaluation and a humanistic attitude",[27] for the other fifty percent. Thus he asked how we might see "the components of evaluation. . . serving as a way in which the orientation of the course can be evaluated in terms of the student;[28] while also asking the question "to what extent are we going to judge them (the learners) by how far they have been willing or able to move into our framework";[29] or, as he put it the following week, "to what extent are we going to judge them in terms of some set of standards?"[30] However, I should point out that the professor did feel that evaluation was something which should be discussed with the students so that "there be agreement on the part of the participants as to what they would consider a fair and equitable way of producing a mark".[31]

The professor was, then, attempting to reconcile an internal learner assessment of the value of the learning experience to him with an external teacher assessment of the extent to which the learner had benefitted from the learning experience through a method of evaluation external to both learner and teacher.

The Professor's Conceptualisations of the Course and Educational Knowledge Codes

In his views on education, and in the initital theorising concerning the course under investigation, the professor is clearly enunciating a philosophical position which is within an Emancipatory Code. The importance he attaches to reflexivity in terms of the learner's existential world, to the development of helical synergy on the part of learners, to the development of methodologies which are dialectical, dialogical and praxiological; all support this fact. However, in the praxis of curriculum development he moved away from, and at times confounded, his own theoretical position.

In his imposition of a three one month course structure as a suggested means of organising the course he was attempting to establish an externally imposed definition of the pace of the learning experience in the spirit of Collection and Integrated Codes, rather than an Emancipatory Code. The curriculum developer and teachers under an Emancipatory Code may identify, at an abstract generalised level, the direction which they feel the course should develop, but they should not impose structures on the learning process. The imposition of such structures immediately reduces the sense of personal direction which learners should develop so that they learn at their own, rather than somebody else's pace.

The failure to practice the methodologies of praxis, reflexivity and dialectic with the G.T.A.s was probably a crucial factor in their failure to practice these with their own learners. However there were immense problems in satisfactorily doing this. Firstly, the problem of time was important. Although the G.T.A.s gave up most of Monday morning on at least half a dozen occasions, the time needed to develop the type of helical synergy, and practice the necessary methodologies was clearly much greater. In my own opinion they would have needed to meet, at least every week, for the whole of the Fall semester. But, secondly, there was not the sense of personal commitment to the professor's philosophical position on the part of the G.T.A.s which might have helped to overcome the shortage of time spent on pre-course meetings. Although he was aware of the probable lack of understanding of his own position on the part of the replacement member of his teaching team, the professor over-estimated the extent to which the other two G.T.A.s were committed to his position. They had great respect for his intellectual capabilities as an academic and for his capacities as a teacher in the Collection Code sense, but were much more doubtful about the affective element in his philosophical position and about the idea of relinquishing control over the pedagogical situation.[32]

However, not only did the G.T.A.s not come to terms with their own existential realities, they also never really investigated the realities of their potential learners. Now, given the structures of the university situation this was a practical impossibility prior to the beginning of the course;[33] but there was little discussion, and no commonality of agreement reached, concerning exactly how the G.T.A.s might do this actually during the course. The result was that two of the three G.T.A.s immediately imposed their own definitions on the pedagogical situation in a true Integrated Code fashion. Also, in terms of the discussions which did take place prior to the beginning of the course, they were not structured so that the energies of the team were concentrated on one particular problem at a time. Therefore the discussion became, at times, desultory, losing sense of purpose and direction.

At the same time the synthetic relationship between curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation was never discussed, and in fact a long discussion concerning methods of evaluation took place[34] without more than passing reference to pedagogy or curriculum as integral parts of the evaluation process. The discussion in fact strayed from Collection to Integrated Codes in its formulations of possible means of evaluation. Added to this, I would seriously question the use of a stanine system of evaluation in any course of the type envisaged by the professor. It is interesting to note, in this regard, that a student who took the course with the professor in the previous year had commented that in terms of the course she took a credit/non-credit system of grading would have been much more appropriate and "assigning a grade appeared trivial".[35] She was, I feel sure in my own mind, correct; and certainly in terms of an Emancipatory Code the use of the University stanine system of evaluation is an impossibility. Even if the evaluation was done totally by the learners, it is still immensely difficult for a learner to evaluate the intrinsic worth of a learning experience to him in terms of a system which is being used concurrently in other courses to evaluated him as a responsive mechanism to discipline and teacher-defined educational realities.

Summary

In short I am suggesting that the professor, in his role as a curriculum developer praxiologically failed to develop many of the prior conditions necessary for the formulations of Emancipatory Code situations between teachers and learners. In part it was due to his own failure to organise more effectively the prior learning experiences of the G.T.A.s; in part it was due to the exigencies of time brought about by the pressures of university life; in part it was due to the inability or unwillingness of the G.T.A.s to perceive their own roles in the terms that the professor perceived them; in part it was due to the failure of the professor to develop and transmit the praxiology which supported his theoretical conceptualisations.

FOOTNOTES

[1] There seemed to be general agreement amongst the thirty students I interviewed that most of their courses were concerned with achieving states of knowledge, with the partial exception of three students who were majoring in so-called non-academic areas - Art, Technical Studies and Drama.

[2] Basil Bernstein, "On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge", in Knowledge and Control ed. by M.F.D.Young, Collier MacMillan 1961.

[3] Howard S.Becker, B.Geer, and E.C.Hughes, Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life John Wiley and Sons 1968.

[4] In fact the regulations merely stipulate that all Education students must take two half-credit courses in the Department of Educational Foundations. However they are strongly advised to take this introductory course because it is the only one offered at a junior level. Hence, in practice, it is considered compulsory by nearly all the students who take it.

[5] I shall use the letters G.T.A. to stand for graduate teaching assistant.

[6] There were, in fact, several sessional lecturers who also taught the course; but, since they were generally considered for teaching purposes in the same light as G.T.A.s, and since they were involved in the sections which I was investigating, I have, for the sake convenience, lumped them together with the G.T.A.s.

[7] as expounded, for example, in P.Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed Seabury Press 1970.

[8] According to Nowlis et al in V.Nowlis, K.E.Clark and M.Rock The Graduate Student as Teacher American Council on Education, 1968

[9] Bernstein, op. cit. pp.64-5

[10] Ibid. pp. 64-5

[11] I am referring only to Anglo-Canada - the situation in French Canada may well be different.

[12] e.g. he gave a recent paper at the 1975 Learned Societies meeting entitled "Education - a Unitary Discipline".

[13] E.V.Stonequist, The Marginal Man: A Study in

Personality and Culture Conflict Russell and Russell 1961 (first published 1937).

[14] R.E.Park and E.W.Burgess, Introduction to the Science of Sociology Chicago 1921.

[15] R.E.Park, "Introduction" in E.V.Stonequist, op. cit. pp. xvii-xviii

[16] Interview with professor November 14th 1974

[17] Ibid.

[18] Introductory lecture to all students from the three sections under investigation 6th January 1975

[19] Interview with professor op. cit.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] A.Skolnick and J.H.Skolnick, Intimacy, Family and Society Little, Brown and Co. 1974

[23] The professor in group discussion with myself and G.T.A.s 9th December 1974.

[24] Interview with professor op. cit.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid.

[27] The professor in group discussion with G.T.A.s and myself 13th January 1975.

[28] The professor in group discussion with G.T.A.s and myself 2nd December 1974.

[29] Ibid.

[30] The professor in group discussion op. cit. 9th December 1974.

[31] The professor in interview op. cit.

[32] I shall examine this more fully in the next chapter.

[33] Since they did not even know who their students were until the beginning of their second semester. However they might have looked at students taking the course in the first semester. Substitute learners, if you like. A student

who took the course the previous year under the professor was interviewed for about an hour during one discussion group; but it would appear, from what G.T.A.s did in the classroom situation, that little notice was taken of her comments.

[34] Group discussion 2nd December op. cit.

[35] Student in group discussion with professor, G.T.A.s and myself 4th November 1974.

CHAPTER V

THE INITIAL PERCEPTIONS OF THE GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANTS AS COURSE INSTRUCTORS

Introduction

In this chapter I shall be examining the role of the graduate teaching assistants as course instructors, as they initially perceived it. As such I shall very briefly look at their biographical background to see if there is anything there which might influence their perceptions of the course. From there I will proceed to examine their initial perceptions of the course and their role as instructors, obtained during interviews carried out in November 1974; and their curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation as practised during the course, obtained through observations and interviews at the end of the first month of the course and at weekly interviews thereafter. Lastly, I will place these in the theoretical context of the three educational knowledge codes I have constructed.

However, before I go on to consider the biographical background of each instructor perhaps I should say a little bit about their role in the more generalised context of the common roles which graduate students, in North America, play in the pedagogy of undergraduate education.

It has been suggested that there are four common roles which graduate students carry out in the pedagogy of undergraduate education. They may be a seminar leader in a team teaching situation where the professor, or a visiting "expert", will provide the "key" lecture which graduate students will then follow up in small group seminar situations; they may act as laboratory assistants in large science courses, and possibly be in charge of the laboratory practicum part of the course; they may be involved in clerical tasks, grading papers, marking examination papers etc.; or they may be "a teacher who appears to have more or less complete responsibility for all the relatively small class he is teaching".[1] However Nowlis, Clark and Rock argue that a graduate student in such a position "is an advanced student who is not easily discriminated from younger members of the faculty and may indeed be mistakenly judged to be a faculty member".[2]

The role of the graduate students I was investigating clearly fall most nearly into the last category of graduate student role, although unlike the situation prior to the 1974-5 academic year, there was some form of professorial supervision of the pedagogical function of the graduate students. But, as I have already indicated the extent of that supervisory function was not stipulated, and in practice varied considerably.

In the case of the professor and the three graduate teaching assistants (G.T.A.s) he was supervising, who were the subject of my investigation, the professor was clearly willing to allow the teaching assistants a great degree of flexibility so far as their own curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation was concerned. In the group discussions prior to the beginning of the course he was making suggestions rather than laying down specific limitations on the actions of the graduate teaching assistants. Basically he wanted them to internalise his own position and use the understandings gained from this internalisation to set up their own pedagogy of praxis.

I have criticised the professor for attempting to establish some form of overall structure on the learning situation because it contravenes the fundamental Emancipatory Code principle of developing learner participation and control over the pedagogical situation. However, it did not prove to be a decisive influence on what two of the instructors did. In other words only one instructor made any real attempt to use the three one month structure suggested by the professor. It is interesting to note that this particular instructor was the one who had replaced an original graduate student who did not return to university. There were, I think, reasons for this which I shall touch upon more fully later.

Throughout this chapter I shall use the nomenclatures of instructor one, instructor two, and instructor three to distinguish them as individual course instructors.

The Biographical Background of the Graduate Student Instructors and its Influence on their Perceptions of the Course

The background of each instructor, as one might expect, has its own unique characteristics; but, at the same time, there are clearly far more similarities between two of the instructors, who are both Albertan bred, and who gained their undergraduate degrees at the University of Alberta, than between them and the third instructor, who gained his undergraduate degree at the University of Guyana and his Master's degree at the University of Essex in England. This third instructor was the replacement for the graduate student who failed to return to University for the academic year 1974-5. Having said this, let me now examine the biographical background of each instructor in turn.

Instructor one was born of Polish parents in the Middle East; but they soon moved to Canada, and he has spent most of his life in Alberta, including all his school and university years.

He entered the University of Alberta in the Fall of 1967 and studied for his B.A., majoring in English with a minor in Political Science. He then left University and worked for a year and a half as a claims adjustor before returning to university to obtain a B.Ed., majoring in Sociology and Political Science, and then proceeded directly to an M.Ed. programme in the Department of Educational

Foundations specialising in the area of Anthropology and History. He was in the second year of this programme when, as part of his graduate teaching assistantship, he was an instructor for the course I investigated.

This instructor, then, had no real teaching experience prior to his acting as an instructor for this course, although he did have the professional training provided as part of his B.Ed. programme.

During his own undergraduate education the instructor had been exposed to a pedagogy mainly involving lecture techniques, although some use of simulation games was made in Political Science courses he took. The means of evaluation was normally examination and term paper or essay. His main criticism of this undergraduate education was that no attempt was made to either define the delimitations of the various discipline areas that he was concerned with, nor was any attempt made to place the material presented during a course in the context of either the educational knowledge which made up the discipline, or educational knowledge as a whole. His criticism is, of course, a classic one of North American course-based Collection Codes with strong modes of classification.[3]

The other criticism which the instructor made of he undergraduate education was that it, at times, lacked academic rigour.[4]

During his graduate career in the Educational Foundations Department the instructor has taken several courses with the professor, who was in charge of the three sections which I have investigated, and hopes to have him as his thesis supervisor. As such the instructor has formed a close personal relationship with the professor and is sympathetic to his concern for the formation of syntheses of human knowledge. Although there were serious differences of opinion which neither professor nor instructor fully explicated prior to the teaching of the course.

The ~~instructor~~ one's own prior biographical experiences probably influenced the way in which he viewed the course he was to teach in several ways.

As a first generation Canadian, who did not speak English until he went to school, it is not surprising to find that he regards the "social integrative function of education as important",[5] nor that he considers the objective of education to be the establishment of "common concepts, common ways of looking at the world to enable all sectors of society to communicate".[6] Education for such recent arrivals to a country,does serve an important socialising function into the prevalent cultural patterns of that country, or in Canadian terms perhaps one should say that province. This concern for commonality was reflected in the objectives that the instructor pursued during the course, which were basically to develop a common methodology for the measurement of the worth of ideas and arguments and to place those ideas or arguments in one of three philosophical positions. While a concern for the synthesis of discrete areas of educational knowledge and the establishment of a meta-methodology may be, in part the result of family background, it is also the result of the instructor's relationship with the professor in charge of the three sections as a student exposed to his ideas in courses the professor has taught, as well as a well-founded criticism of the course-based Collection Code system of organising educational knowledge. For such a system neither provides the under-pinning of common ideological understandings between participating teachers nor does it provide the structural support of a discipline framework into which the student is immersed and socialised. But, whatever the reason for this concern, it does seem to have determined, in a large part, the instructor's perception of the course.

However, while the instructor may well have developed, in part, an understanding and concern for the integration of human knowledge from the professor, he explicitly rejected the emotive personal commitment that the professor also stressed, and the concern for the development of learner directed action. His experience with T group situations, and the general reputation of such courses in the university during the late 1960s and early 1970s as "easy ways of getting grades", help to explain both his and instructor two's rejection of the emotive element and the notion of learner direction which the professor hoped would be a part of the course. But I should also point out that the instructor had no pedagogical experience which could even begin to help him to develop the type of pedagogy which the professor had in mind, and his own experience with anything approaching that type of pedagogy was clearly, for him, unsatisfactory.

Lastly, the close relationship which the instructor had formed with the professor made him aware, as it did instructor two, that the professor would allow them considerable latitude to interpret his initial ideas in any way they wanted. But, at the same time, it led him to the false belief that he had established common understandings with the professor concerning the form that the course should take. As he put it "instructor two and I have socialised with the professor and established underlying meanings".[7] In fact they were very far apart in their views on the way in which the course should be taught.

Instructor two was born and brought up in a rural area just north of Edmonton. His parents were farmers of German stock and fundamentalist Baptist religious persuasion. He was educated in the local high school and then the University of Alberta where he took a B.Ed. in which he initially specialised in History and Sociology but, in his fourth year, specialised in Anthropology. The pedagogy of his undergraduate education was mainly lectures, although a few courses also utilised seminars and tutorials as part of their pedagogy.

Like instructor one his main criticisms of his undergraduate education were that there were "too many survey courses of haphazard quality"[8] in which no attempt was made to relate different areas of knowledge, and that there was a general lack of academic rigour in many of the courses.

Having completed his B.Ed. programme the instructor taught Social Sciences and English for four years in junior and senior high schools in Alberta before returning full-time to work on his M.Ed. programme in the Educational Foundations Department where he is specialising in the area of Anthropology. He, like instructor one, has taken several courses from the professor in charge of the three sections, and expects that he (the professor) will be his thesis supervisor, and shares the professor's concern for the formation of syntheses of human knowledge.

It was during the second semester of his full-time attendance in the M.Ed. programme that instructor two taught the course which I am investigating.

The influence of these biographical experiences was made apparent in several ways.

Although instructor two has broken with the fundamentalist religious background of his parents it probably influenced his later development considerably. He describes it as producing a continuing "interest in the psyche"[9] and may well help to explain his interest in existentialism, an interest which came out at times during the course in attempts to integrate philosophical existentialism with scientistic rationalism.

Like instructor one his dissatisfaction with the course-based Collection Code of his undergraduate education, together with the understandings he developed during courses he took with the professor in charge of the three sections led him to see the course as an attempt to synthesise various areas of educational knowledge, although he was not concerned so much with the development of the specifics of a particular methodology. However, he was concerned about the need for the course to be "intellectually respectable" which can be seen as a reaction to what he described as the "continual fostering of anti-intellectual ideas" during his undergraduate education. Added to this, he, like instructor one, had developed a distrust of the notion of personal commitment and learner direction due to the unsavoury reputation they had gained during his time as an undergraduate. Similarly, having taken courses with the professor in charge of the three sections, he considered that he had internalised his (the professor's) position and so was able to freely interpret it in the teaching of the course. However all instructor two's own pedagogical experiences at a university level had been teacher directed and, in his own school experience, he had always retained ultimate control of the pedagogical situation. Therefore he, like instructor one, had no experience of the type of pedagogy which the professor was suggesting should be used in the course.

The instructor also made use of his school experience to "teach by example", using different inflections in his voice, moving round the room, and quoting from his own experiences on several occasions. At the same time he appears to have interpreted the professor's notion of praxis in terms of passing on what he has learnt as a teacher to the students as intending teachers. As he put it "I am not just trying to get theory through but also to give them something they can use directly in their teaching".[10]

Lastly, both instructors one and two drew very much on the understandings of student types which they developed during their own undergraduate days to hypothesise about the type of student they would have in their courses. They both felt that, since they had attended the same university as undergraduates, that they understood both the students and the type of problem which would concern them.

Instructor three has a background very different from instructors one and two. He comes from a working class family in Guyana, one of the small states in the Caribbean which make up the confederation commonly referred to as the

West Indies. After attending primary school he passed the pupil-teacher's examination, and so was eligible himself to teach in a primary school. However, as a member of minority groups, being both East Indian ethnically and non-Christian, he found it very difficult to obtain employment as a teacher, and so worked in a sugar factory for two years. Having finally succeeded in obtaining a teaching post he worked as a teacher for several years in a primary school before entering a Teacher Training College to obtain certification as a class one trained teacher, the highest professional teaching qualification available in Guyana at the time.

It was only after obtaining his professional qualifications that he began his personal academic training. Having obtained the requisite 'A' level G.C.E. passes the instructor began a Social Sciences degree at the newly formed University of Guyana.

At this time the university was a part-time evening institution, similar to Birkbeck College, London University, and the instructor continued to teach while he studied. The fact that this was a newly formed, and the first, university in Guyana, combined with the under provision of educational facilities, especially above the rudimentary levels, which are the traditional legacy of British rule, and the fact that it was an evening institute which could be attended by working members of society; attracted mature students who already often held elite positions in Guyanese society. This, together with the small size of the university[11] and the relatively small elite group, created a sense of social cohesiveness and an interaction at an interpersonal level, both on and off campus, between lecturers and students, virtually unknown in North American universities. Added to this the Social Sciences degree which the instructor took had a much stronger discipline base than is usual in North American degrees, so that almost half his courses were in his major area of specialisation, Sociology.

The instructor's criticisms of his undergraduate education are also those often associated with a newly independent country of the Third World: a lack of adequate lecturers, adequate in the sense of qualifications and competence and adequate in the sense of job responsibility and professionalism; and a lack of a well stocked, "university standard" library, as defined by advanced industrial countries.

Having won the Governor General's medal as the academically best student of his year, the instructor went to the University of Essex to study for an M.A. in Sociology, before returning to his old university as a lecturer.

After several years in this post the instructor decided he needed to upgrade his qualifications, since a new graduate programme in the Social Sciences was beginning at his university, and so came to the Educational Foundations Department to study under a professor who is an acknowledged expert on Guyanese society. As a means of financing his studies he took a teaching assistantship and found himself working with the professor under investigation in the second semester of the 1974-5 academic year, having taught another section of the same course with a different professor in the first semester. The 1974-5 academic year was also the first year of the instructor's own Ph.D. programme, and he had had no previous contact with the professor in charge of the three sections I have investigated prior to the pre-course meetings which began in November 1974.

Instructor three's intellectual and personal experiences are very different from those of the other two instructors. He was brought up and trained in an educational system based on discipline orientated European Collection Codes, rather than North American course based Collection Codes. Thus he has remarked "I am a sociologist who finds himself in this department (Educational Foundations) by chance of circumstance".[12] As such he, like most of the members of the department, does not share the concern of the professor, or the other two instructors, with the synthesising of various areas of human knowledge. Thus, his interpretation of the professor's ecumenical level was a section based on a criticism of readings taken almost exclusively from the area of the sociology of education, his own area of specialisation.

At the same time, however, his lack of knowledge of the professor, his experience with a professor teaching the same course in the previous semester, and his unfamiliarity with the philosphical position of the professor, probably explain why he followed the structure which the professor suggested for the course, and attempted, especially in the early stages of the course, to carry out more closely than the other instructors the wishes of the professor. In other words, a recognised unfamiliarity with what was expected in terms of the professor or the pedagogy of the course meant that instructor three had to develop his understandings specifically from what the professor said in the pre-course discussions. Therefore his reliance on readings from the sociology of education for his third level, or month, of the course was due to a misunderstanding of what the professor meant by ecumenical, rather than an attempt to impose his own bias on the pedagogical situation. However, given his strong disciplinary background, one might expect him to, once he had interpreted ecumenical as theoretical,[13] utilise theoretical perspectives from within his discipline area of knowledge.

The instructor's attitude towards the students he was to teach was also clearly influenced by his own background. Having worked as student and lecturer amongst mainly mature students in very small groups, by Albertan university undergraduate standards, where students were expected to come to terms with the understandings of the discipline and were strongly motivated to succeed due to the highly selective university selection process; the instructor found it difficult to establish a rapport with Canadian university students. In his comparison of the students he worked with he said "these were all big men themselves, not little ex-high school students";[14] and when asked, during the interview in which he made the previous comment, which students he expected to be most responsive, he stated that he expected them to be basically the older students; while, in the course he was then teaching "the ones I find are not very keen are basically the youngest in the group".[15]

Combined with this uncertainty about the capacities of the students he was to teach, was an assumption that they would be willing or able to enter the discipline world of sociology of education some two-thirds of the way through the course. This may well reflect assumptions quite valid in his previous, more strongly discipline orientated pedagogical situations, but of more doubtful validity in the course that he taught in the second semester of the 1974-5 academic year at the University of Alberta.

Lastly, instructor three was the only instructor with previous university teaching experience. During some four years as a university lecturer he probably developed a teaching style that was incompatible with the pedagogy which the professor envisaged should be used in the courses he was supervising, and the instructor did remark that, if given a free hand teaching the same course next year, he would "opt for the traditional approach and. . . basically stick to the lecture method as a framework"[16] for his pedagogy. There was then a lack of personal commitment to the pedagogy and curriculum necessary for the sort of success envisaged by the professor and, indeed, the type of commitment necessary would have meant a denial by the instructor of his own commitment as a sociologist and of his own expertise as a university teacher.

The Instructors' Initial Perceptions of the Course

Most of the data for these perceptions was collected during interviews conducted with each instructor in late November 1974. As such they do not represent the finally formulated thoughts of the instructors immediately prior to the beginning of the course, but rather their thoughts on the course after some three to four meetings with the professor where the type and implications of the course had been discussed. However they already reveal differences of opinion between instructors and professor and the developing pedagogical positions of the instructors.

In analysing this data I shall also mention the instructors' philosophical positions regarding the more general aims of education itself and undergraduate education in particular, since this helps to throw light on the perspectives they take in the teaching of the various sections of the course which are the subject of this study. In doing this I will, at times, be repeating what I have said earlier when looking at the biographical influences on the instructors' pedagogical role. I trust the reader will bear with me in this matter.

Instructor one saw the aims and objectives of education in terms of:

> Exploring various segments of society to better do whatever function they want to perform in society. . . (while developing the capacity to) . . .constantly refer back to common concept, common ways of looking at the world to enable all sectors of society to communicate.[17]

As such his view of education is essentially functionalist and consensual, although it is a consensus founded on scientistic rationalism rather than common-sense understanding, as I hope to demonstrate. We may see instructor one then as, in his approach to education, taking the position of what Taylor, Walton and Young call radical positivism, where the task of the educator:

> Is to discover the true consensus. This true consensus is of course to be found in the needs of the system: the advance of society is the advance of men towards harmony within a civilised and balanced society.[18]

Within this framework the instructor saw undergraduate education as performing two basic functions: the transmission of knowledge, building on that already gained in school; and, the more important function, of:

> Exploring different conceptual patterns, exploring different paradigms of thought to try and find common denominators for the human condition.[19]

Given what the instructor had said previously, certain of the aims he laid down for the course he was to teach seemed a little out of place. Thus, while one might have expected him to see the aims in terms of "introducing people to the possibility of other world views. . . and developing the ability to transcend situations",[20] it was a little surprising to find him also emphasising the development of "the ability to empathise".[21] However, as it turned out, this was a function of the course which he regarded as marginal to the main purpose, and it may represent, as indeed did all he said about the aims of the course he was to teach, a struggle which was going on between his interpretation of what the aims of the course were and the professor's interpretation, a struggle which was apparent during the group discussions.[22]

Although he had not worked out the details of his curriculum[23] at this time, the instructor mentioned certain aspects and approaches which in fact dominated the substance of his curriculum.

The instructor intended to begin the course with a series of lectures in the form of "information packages", as he called them which would cover the main discipline areas within the Educational Foundations Department; and so indicate "what possible modes of thought exist within this very small department".[24] From there he would take "a series of issues and solve them in different ways".[25] However he emphasised the point that the issues themselves were not important, rather the importance of the exercise was in "the method of analysis of what constitutes a social problem".[26] This emphasis on the development of a methodology of analysis was to be the major theme of his course and, as such, required his students to enter an intellectual world defined by the instructor as a teacher.

It is, of course, apparent that instructor one, in his perceptions of the curriculum for the course, had moved far away from the professor's conceptualisations.

In terms of pedagogy the instructor also had moved far from the professor's position. He saw pedagogy for the course in terms of presentations and classroom discussions where there would be "a large group with me very obviously the central figure in the situation".[27].He envisaged that the balance between presentation and discussion would be such that there would be:

> A formal presentation of a school or theory of thought once every three or four lectures to act as a counterbalance (for the discussions) and as a summary (of a particular intellectual position).[28]

In these formal presentations, and during the presentation of any material, the instructor did not regard himself as being dogmatic; rather, as he put it, "what I'm presenting is my opinion, but my opinion holds water for these and these reasons, or at least I think it does. . . I invite anyone to challenge it".[29] However this must be seen in the light of what he said later: "the rules are real, they exist. There are ways in which one argument is sounder than another".[30] These rules of course were defined by him, not arbitrarily, but in the light of his position as a radical positivist.

Having said all this the instructor clearly did not intend to dominate the situation so totally that all the classroom interaction involved merely isolated individuals responding to his stimuli. As he put it himself, "if everybody leaves the class agreeing they have learnt more from me than anybody else - I think I will have failed".[31] Rather he saw his role as defining the limitations of what would be regarded as relevant, and what would be accepted as valid methodology. But, at the same time, he wanted the students to use him as a role model. This is evident from his hope that the most successful student in the course would "begin to duplicate any analysis that I can do".[32]

It is interesting to note that he rejected the widespread use of small group interactionas a pedagogical device because:

> A lot of people get hurt if this type of contact is enforced. There is a personal and emotional reaction which will over-rule anything I'm trying

to do in a broader sense".[33]

He suggested that the students might meet elsewhere in small groups instead.[34] His concern about the psychological problem which might arise from small group interaction was shared by instructor two and some of the students. As such it seems to reflect a fear of debate and argument on an individualised face to face level which I have noticed is prevalent amongst both faculty and students at this university. If Ziman is correct in his suggestion that this dislike of debate and argument at an individual level is a major difference between North American and English approaches to and organisation of science;[35] then there may exist fundamental differences between the understandings and approaches to knowledge amongst North American and European intellectuals. The problem, in terms of carrying out the type of pedagogy which the professor had in mind, is that it relies upon the willingness of students and teachers to encourage and participate in argument and debate at an interpersonal level so that, through a dialectical interplay, new syntheses can be formed.

Lastly, in terms of pedagogy, the instructor intended to try and run for part of the course, his section as two classes, offering a three hour evening course for students who were interested. He hoped that he could get about ten people to take the evening course and he hypothesised that "these are the ten people I would say are at the top of the class".[36] This was done to reduce the size of the day class, which, given the expected numbers of forty to fifty students per course, would reduce the day class to a size which he felt he could handle. However he did intend to fuse the two classes about half-way through the term because he felt the work load of teaching two classes would then become too heavy. But, by then, he hoped that each class would have developed an atmosphere of co-operation so that he would be able to retain a personal contact with and control over the larger class.

In considering evaluation there were again already major differences between the professor and the instructor. He felt that there should be two parts to the evaluation: the first, and major, part in which students demonstrate "the degree to which they can integrate and criticise theoretical positons in terms of cross-disciplinary perspectives; and a second part, where they can speculate on possible areas of resolution".[37] Of course, the framework for the cross-disciplinary perspectives would be established by the instructor under his methodology of analysis.

The instructor totally rejected the notion of a self evaluation which the professor had suggested. As he put it:

> I am personally of the opinion that the perception of it (self-evaluation) is an evasion of responsibility rather than an allowing of freedom and respect for intellect.[38]

Given his position on curriculum and pedagogy it is not surprising to find him taking a position on evaluation which sees it as carried out within the framework which he laid down for curriculum and pedagogy, and which he wished to retain total control over.

In ending this consideration of instructor one's initial perceptions of the course, I should remark that it is something of a tribute to the fore-thought and organisational capacities of the instructor that he already had his course of action so clearly delineated. As one might expect, perhaps, he diverged relatively little from it in the teaching of the course.

Instructor two suggested that there should be three main aims of education:

> The development of enough personal understanding to get creative energy going in the recipient so that he is no longer a recipient, but an active, individual working self. . .; the bringing together of enough technological understanding to aid in species survival; and also to give a better sense of "being" in the tradition of the classical education of the humanities.[39]

As such his views on education can be seen to belong to that complex position between phenomenology and existentialsm which attempts to integrate the concepts of man as a free self-determining individual, untroubled by the constraints of society, with the concept of scientistic rationalism which views technological progress as separate from and uninfluenced by the values and social organisation of a society of which it is a part.

Although the instructor was unwilling to be specific in his views on the function of undergraduate education, he was clearly concerned that students should develop, during this period, an intellectual, idealist orientation so that they both develop a liking for the use of theoretical perspectives in organising their understanding of the world, and learn how to use such theoretical perspectives.

The instructor was more specific in his perceptions of the objectives of the course he was to teach. He saw these as two fold: firstly "the development of a critical philosophical understanding of ideas that are in their (the learners') self development",[40] and secondly an attempt to "personally rationalise psychological models".[41] The two are obviously closely linked and could be said to overlap; but in the first objective the instructor was, I think, more concerned with the intellectual knowledge which the students had obtained during their prior education; while in the second he was more concerned with the use of psychological models of behaviour to form a theoretical framework within which the students could place and analyse their own prior "biographical process".

While considering the instructor's perception of the objectives of the course I should add that the instructor originally intended to use the framework that the professor had suggested; and he was also the only instructor who suggested that the three instructors produce outlines of their intended courses which showed the concepts they would use, their convergence areas, and the use of the dialectical process.[42] While I have already criticised the development of such structures for the course as antithetical to Emancipatory Code situations and to the professor's original intentions, it was one of the few occasions on which any of the instructors showed a concern for the development of common understandings and approaches to the teaching of the course. I should also add that this instructor had thought mainly about the first part of the course, as explicated by the professor, and had not decided how he would proceed from there. This may be reflected to some extent in his conceptualisation of the objectives of the course, although,in my opinion, the objectives reflect his overall position with regard to education, rather than merely the professor's first section of the course.

In his conceptualisation of the curriculum the instructor's thoughts had, at this time, been mainly concerned with what the professor termed the egocentric, or first stage, of the course. During this stage the instructor hoped students would develop greater self-understanding and learn to incorporate psychological models into their analysis. To help to achieve this he said that he was going "to feed in a certain amount of very readable sources - things I used in Psychology 20".[43] However he expected each person to utilise and adapt these theoretical perspectives to their own needs. As he put it:

> Always the person himself deciding how is this outside structure or analysis of the social situation or model of the psyche directly personally usable for me.[44]

His interpretations of the professor's concept of praxis differed radically from what the professor had intended, so that he rejected the professor's notion of "political praxis" for the phenomenologically more acceptable "political awareness";[45] and expressed grave doubts about the possibility of attaining the ecumenical, or stage three, level of the course. His interpretation of praxis seems to have involved, as I have already remarked previously,[46] an attempt to add a professional training element to the course, "to give them (the students) something they can use directly in their teaching",[47] The other point which I made in the same previous section concerning academic rigour was also reflected in the instructor's concern that there should be "serious content"[48] otherwise the course would degenerate into "a kind of holding hands".[49] This serious content, of course, was to be decided by the instructor.

The instructor, then, viewed the curriculum in the form of realities structured by theoretical perspectives on the behaviour of man, from which each student would extract and interpret his own meaning.

In what I have said about the instructor's views on the curriculum there are assumptions about the forms of pedagogy that might be used which the instructor did not make explicit in conversation. Thus, in the presentation of the theoretical models which he wished the students to use he had in mind a form of lecture in the fairly traditional manner backed up by class discussions. However he was uncertain about the value or possibility of learning through dialogue; and so proposed the use of simulation games to support the basic lecture, class discussion pattern of pedagogy. His remarks on this point are enlightening because they reveal his dissatisfaction with the idea of achieving a synthesis of personal positions through a dialectical dialogue. They are as follows:

> I have some doubts about the efficacy of simple dialogue. . . discussion gets to the point of that's your position, O.K. this is my position - there's a stand-off New developments often don't arise through that sort of dialogue.[50]

Therefore, drawing on his experiences as a teacher in high school, he felt that "with some strategies like games and scenarios you can get over the limitations of talk".[51]

Like instructor one he expressed grave doubts about small group interaction. Here he drew to some extent on his own experiences as an undergraduate, in what was a very different situation to the one the professor had envisaged. As he put it, "associations with people were a real drag, having to meet over a paper when you had very little in common except that course". Also he was very concerned about the possibility of conflict between members of small groups and he remarked that, if he was going to attempt any form of small group work, he would have "to figure out some ways of not putting clashing people together".[52] This concern reflected a fundamental incompatibility with the position of the professor and with the role of small groups and dialogue under an Emancipatory Code.

The instructor's views on evaluation revealed that he was very doubtful about the notion of self-evaluation; and he described his views on evaluation as:

> An attempt to have people understand that it's their work and ideas and their compilation of others' ideas that are being graded, not them personally.[53]

This is possible in a Collection Code situation where the knowledge being purveyed by the instructor can be viewed as impersonal and unrelated to the learners' own realities; but it becomes very difficult when learners are asked to relate knowledge given in the course to their own understandings. Then, as Bernstein has rightly recorded,[54] there is an unavoidable personal element in the learner's interpretation of his evaluation by the teacher.

However the instructor, apparently, became aware of this problem prior to the beginning of the course because he suggested, in a group discussion on 6th January 1975, that the instructors adopt a pass/fail mode of evaluation since it was impossible to evaluate a change in consciousness in terms of a stanine.[55] Interestingly neither the professor nor the other instructors took any notice of this suggestion, and so the discussion passed on to other matters.

I should, though, remark that it was clear that this instructor had not, at the time that I interviewed him, clarified his thoughts on the teaching of the course in the same way as instructor one, and so there were significant differences, in certain areas between his initial perceptions of the course and how he actually taught it.

Instructor three considered that the objectives of education could be subsumed under two broad perspectives: education as "preparation for life, to live with fellow human beings, the socialisation aspect",[56] which he regarded as the more important perspective; and education "for self-fulfilment".[57]

To obtain a better picture of what he means by "preparation for life" we need to consider the role which he believed that undergraduate education at the University of Alberta should carry out in the education system. He saw education for students at this institution in terms of "a preparation for the needs of the society", "individual fulfilment" and the "exploration of realms of knowledge". However he considered that the needs of the society must supersede all other objectives, "since the tax payer is paying for the student's education".[59]

This position, combined with the importance he attaches to a position of scientific neutrality and objectivity, which he has expressed on several occasions to me in conversation, suggest to me that this instructor can be classified as what Taylor, Walton and Young call a "liberal positivist".[60] These authors write of liberal positivism that it:

> Solves the problems of objectivity by denying that questions of value are the concern of the scientist. The politicians. . . decide on the central problems that face a society and the major aims of political and social legislation. The scientist is exclusively concerned with the means whereby certain ends. . . may be achieved.[61]

In his perceptions of the course, however, this instructor attempted to follow much more closely the suggestions of the professor than did the other two instructors, so that he did not try to lay out his own position in contra-distinction to the professor in quite the same way as did the other instructors. I have already commented on this and suggested some reasons for why it might be so elsewhere.[62]

The instructor saw the objectives of the course he was to teach in terms of making it "meaningful for students", "changing their way of thinking"[63] and the development of the classroom into one where gemeinschaft rather than gesellschaft relationships were predominant. In talking about a move from gesellschaft to gemeinschaft forms of relationship in the classroom the instructor contrasted the situation at the University of Alberta with that at his own university. Although he was aware of the differences in the nature of society and the type of student attending each university, he seemed unaware that the type of pedagogical relationship the professor had in mind would be radically different from that which existed under a discipline form of Collection Code at his own university. However the exact form of pedagogical relationship which the professor had in mind was never fully discussed, so that it is not surprising to find this instructor, like the others, developing his own interpretation based on his own prior experiences.

In his perceptions of the curriculum the instructor intended to use the structure which the professor had suggested; but had only decided, at the time of the interview, what he would do in the first or "egocentric" unit of the course. In this first unit he intended to ask the students what their interests were in terms of this course, ask them to record them on cards, group them in small groups according to like interests, and use these interests as the starting point for discussion.[64] By doing this he felt he was starting with the students' own interests, and this is true to some extent; but this starting point could also lead to topics concerned with an unreflexive understanding of the world and an avoidance of the examination of the existential realities of their personal worlds. This is why I feel, under Emancipatory Codes, that one needs initially to provide some direction and structure to the pedagogical situation, and to teh curriculum.

As I have already stated, the instructor had not thought in detail what he might do after the first stage of the course; but he did see the ecumenical, or third level, of the professor as referring to forms of macro-theory and "theoretical insights into the problems we are going to discuss",[65] which he would provide for the students. This was clearly a misinterpretation of what the professor had in mind, but I shall come back to it when considering the forms of pedagogy which he wished to use.

Unlike the other two instructors, instructor three did not express serious misgivings about small group work and intended to group his class in "sub groups of five to six, based on their concerns and interests"[66] for discussion purposes, making the point that in this way "each individual would feel that he belonged to a primary group".[67] It would appear from what he said at the time of the interview, that the instructor intended to utilise the small groups at least for the purpose of dialogue about matters of common interest.

However he saw himself as having certain inputs in terms of content "especially at the third level where we are going to look at certain theoretical insights into the problems we are going to discuss"[68]

Thus the instructor stressed the importance of small group dialogue in the pedagogical situation but saw himself as having a role to play in terms of the provision of learning content, a role which would increase at the third level of the course.

Like the other two instructors, the third instructor had serious misgivings about the professor's idea of fifty percent of the evaluation being based on student self evaluation. These misgivings were based, in part, on the experience he had in the first semester with regard to the use of self-evaluation. Although he does not seem to have realised the fundamentally different orientation which, at least in principle, was intended for the course he was to teach in the second simester, as opposed to the course he taught in the first semester. Also, though, his feeling that "I should have a major say in evaluation" may well reflect his own prior experience as a university lecturer in a Collection Code situation. He certainly expressed, at a later date, some strong views supporting the use of evaluation as a means of social control by increasing the likelihood that students would be given a fail grade.[69]

This commentary on instructor three's initial perceptions of the course has been particularly difficult to write and, I think, much of the problem stems from the fact that instructor three, unlike the other two instructors, was unfamiliar with all aspects of the professor's position and, coming from a discipline orientated Colleciton Code background had little sympathy or understanding for any aspect of what the professor wished to do. As such all he could do was try to carry out, in a mechanical fashion, what the professor suggested and was unable to develop a position of his own which he could rationalise in any form as compatible with that of the professor. In short there was never, as there was with the other two instructors, a sense of personal commitment towards what he was doing. I do not mean to suggest by this that the instructor was not conscientious in his responsibilities as an instructor, for it would be patently untrue to do so, rather am I suggesting that the instructor was intellectually committed to a much stronger disciplinary orientation. As he, himself, remarked at the end of the course, if he was given a free hand to teach the course again, he would "infuse much more sociology of education".[70]

The Instructors' Initial Perceptions of the Course and Educational Knowledge Codes

In their views on the objectives of education all three instructors revealed philosophical positions which were incompatible with the position of a teacher intending to teach in the Emancipatory Code mode.

Thus all three have ignored the socially reflexive dimension so necessary to examine the "deep structures" of one's own position in the society of which one is a part, and the "deep structures" of that society itself. Nobody saw, as an essential part of education, the examination of the distribution of power and exercise of social control, either at a local, national or international level.

Similarly there was no notion of praxis in the Emancipatory Code sense, rather praxis was interpreted within the implicitly ideological understandings of the "needs of society", functions within society and "technological understandings"; where who defines these needs, functions etc. remains unquestioned.

Instructor one, in his initial formulations of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation, was clearly working within an Integrated Code. Under the curriculum his integrating idea was what he termed "the method of analysis of what constitutes a social problem",[71] which he would define for the students. This would then become the limiting factor for what would be defined as valid knowledge and would serve as the "rules" in terms of which questions and understandings must be formulated.

Having once established the delimitations of the integrating idea pedagogically there was no reason why the instructor should not have considered the use of small groups. However his prior experiences as a student, with small groups, plus, perhaps, a generalised North American dislike for small group interaction at a university level, made him eschew this approach. There may well have been a concern also, partly induced because the instructor had no previous teaching experience and so was uncertain of his own capacity to retain control of a situation where power had been partially disseminated to small student groups, that he could only exercise effective control over the defined limits of the pedagogical situation by retaining a large group, even for discussion situations. The instructor's desire to use formal lectures every three or four lectures may well have reflected a desire to restate the delimitations of the pedagogical situation and re-emphasise his control as a teacher. There is here, of course, the added problem that all instructors, and especially instructors one and two, probably felt in something of a false and precarious position because they were being asked to take on the role of a teacher without the institutional or academic recognition which would legitimise that role. This may well affect the security of instructors in such a position and so increase their need to re-emphasise their control. I shall say more about this in the next chapter where I think it was an important factor in the initial behaviour of instructors one and two.

It is interesting to note, in this regard, that instructor one gave as his reason for seeking to divide his class into two groups the fact that he felt he could not handle a class of forty to fifty,[72] the original number it was envisaged would enrol in the course. The implication being that he felt he could not exercise the necessary control over the pedagogical situation with a class of that size.

The instructor's rejection of any form of student evaluation was to be expected, given his position concerning curriculum and pedagogy. As he remarked in a group discussion "considering what I want to do there is no room for self-evaluation".[73] He was certainly correct for, as I have already indicated, he had already determined that evaluation would be in terms of his own definitions of valid argument and methodology.

In his initial perceptions of the course instructor one explicitly denied the forms of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation applicable to an Emancipatory Code in favour of those of an Integrated Code.

Instructor two is also clearly within an Integrated Code formulation in his initial perceptions of curriculum and pedagogy for the course.

In his conceptualisation of the curriculum the instructor was concerned with the presentation of theoretical models of human behaviour through which the students could analyse their own existential realities. By determining and explaining these models he would, like instructor one, be providing a teacher defined framework within which students would work. There does not seem to have been the same conscious determination to rigidly structure the learning situation in quite the same way as instructor one had envisaged; but the intent was still made clear that the instructor would define the delimitations of valid knowledge and valid methodologies. In this light we can view his avowed intent "to give them (the students) something they can use directly in their teaching"[74] as an attempt to introduce an area of understanding where the instructor had established an institutionally acceptable legitimacy as a practising teacher. Although there was the added incentive that he would also be able to avoid the often expressed concern of students that courses like the one he was teaching were irrelevant because they taught you nothing about "how to teach".[75]

In his discussion of the types of pedagogy the instructor might employ it was apparent that he preferred lecture, class discussion and simulation games to small group interaction. I have already commented on possible reasons why instructors one and two might have been opposed to small group interaction, in terms of the intellectual traditions of North American universities and their social and institutional positions as teachers; but I should also remind the reader of this instructor's own biographical experiences of small group interaction, to which I have previously alluded. His substitution of simulation games for small group interaction may well reflect a belief that it would be easier to retain and enforce teacher definitions of the educational situation in such games. In this regard the instructor told an interesting anecdote about one of the simulation games he had used in high school. As he put it:

> A particular student became so involved with the game that he was not operating on the kind of level that we're playing a game to learn something about the way societies operate. That level was lost - he jumped to, shall I say a lower level of animal rationale, grabbed a machine gun and shot all the dissident members of society.[76]

The interesting point is that he criticised, and clearly regarded as less valid than his own, that particular child's definition of the situation. The fact that this was told as an anecdote suggests that such a wrong reading of the instructor's "signals" defining the learning situation during such simulation games, was relatively infrequent. In other words the instructor had found such games a very good manipulative device in his previous teaching experience.

The instructor's views on evaluation were, in my opinion, incompatible with his views on curriculum and pedagogy because they supposed that the instructor would be able to claim impersonality in his evaluations because of the needs of prior structures of reality which he must acknowledge. However he did remark later in the conversation that "in some ways grading would be extremely subjective with extremely objective elements";[77] thus acknowledging, at least in principle, that he had recognised the need for evaluation in terms of both cognitive and dispositional attributes under an Integrated Code.

Instructor three's position in terms of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation is complicated by the fact that, as I have attempted to indicate already, it did not appear to me to be a position that he was personally committed to, so that his main concern was to try and carry out the professor's suggestions, rather than develop a deliberate position which, while incorporating part of the professor's perspective, represented a position to which he could feel personally committed. It is interesting to note, in this regard, that this instructor was the only one to suggest that the professor provide, at the beginning of the course, a "general policy statement",[78] which instructor one rejected because he argued that "we are doing the same thing different ways",[79] and instructor two because "it is our task, not the professor's to reinterpret his ideas".[80]

At the same time this instructor rejected the ideas of Freire describing them scornfully as an "apology for dictators",[81] not apparently realising the importance of Freire's ideas as an attempt to view education in the form of an Emancipatory Code. Indeed I think it fair to say that for an instructor to have empathy for the professor's conceptualisation of the course he would also have to be empathetic towards what Freire was saying in the "Pedagogy of the Oppressed". This is important because a sense of personal commitment to the curriculum, pedagogy and means of evaluation you intend to use as a teacher is essential to be successful in Integrated or Emancipatory Codes, and I believe this was missing in the case of instructor three.

Having said this let me examine this instructor's initial perceptions of the course in the light of the framework of educational knowledge codes I have set up.

The instructor's thoughts concerning curriculum suggest, in the first section of the course, and this is where he had formulated his thoughts most clearly, that he was moving towards an Emancipatory Code situation by starting from student interests, but there was little indication of how he would use these interests to achieve a reflexive understanding by the learners of their immediate existential realities, and there is clearly a need for guidance for the learners at this stage of development. In his initial perceptions of curriculum for stage three, however, the instructor was clearly establishing his own definitions in terms of theoretical insights which he intended to impose on the learners' existential realities. As such he had moved into an Integrated Code position.

In terms of pedagogy, similarly, the instructor in his intended use of small group interaction, was moving towards the pedagogy of an Emancipatory Code; but in his suggestion that he would exercise more control in the third stage of the course he clearly moved back into an Integrated Code position, for under an Emancipatory Code. by this stage, the students should have moved or be moving towards increasing control over the pedagogical situation as they move towards a position of "helical synergy".

Lastly his concern over student evaluation and his belief that he should have a major say in student evaluation is obviously the position of a teacher in the Integrated Code mode, while his desire to have evaluation used as a means of social control, expressed later,[82] moves him more into the area of a Collection Code.

Conclusion

None of the instructors then, in their view of education as a whole, or in their initial perceptions of their roles as teachers, moved more than marginally into an Emancipatory Code situation. In part it was the fault of the professor because he never clearly explicated the fundamental principles of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation under an Emancipatory Code. But, even if he had, it is highly unlikely that they would have been willing, and perhaps able, to incorporate a methodology including elements of reflexivity, dialogue, dialectic and praxis into their philosophical positions concerning the objectives of education. To have done this they would have had to move from their various positions of radical and liberal positivism and phenomenology to at least the position of the critical theorists at the level of educationalists and then be willing to practice this philosophy as teachers. I am not sure that the professor was willing to follow through fully the praxiology of such a philosophical position and I am certain the instructors were not, even at the level of theoretical educationalists hypothesising what they might do when teaching the course.

FOOTNOTES

[1] V.Nowlis, K.E.Clark and M.Rock, The Graduate Student as Teacher American Council on Education 1968 p. 2.

[2] Ibid. p. 2.

[3] Basil Bernstein, "On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge" in Knowledge and Control ed. by M.F.D.Young, Collier-MacMillan 1971.

[4] Interview with instructor one November 20th 1974.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Stated in group discussion between the three instructors, the professor and myself November 4th 1974.

[8] Interview with instructor two November 15th 1974.

[9] Interview with instructor two August 15th 1975.

[10] Interview with instructor two November 15th 1974.

[11] At the time the istructor attended the university there were about fourteen hundred undergraduate students enrolled.

[12] In conversation with instructor three - date unknown.

[13] Interview with instructor three November 27th 1974.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] Interview with instructor three April 10th 1975.

[17] Interview with instructor two November 20th 1974.

[18] Ian Taylor, Paul Walton, and Jock Young, The New Criminology: For a Social Theory of Deviance Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. 1973 p. 20.

[19] Interview with instructor one November 20th 1974.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] This was particularly apparent in a group discussion between the three instructors, the professor and myself on November 25th 1974. In this discussion the instructor outlined an approach he thought he would take in teaching the course, to which the professor replied "you are doing in the first month what I would do in the third month". It is interesting to note that the instructor, in fact, followed quite closely the outline he suggested at this meeting.

[23] Bernstein's definition - Bernstein, op. cit.

[24] Interview with instructor one November 20th 1974.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Interview with instructor one February 11th 1975.

[31] Interview with instructor one November 20th 1974.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Ibid.

[34] In group discussion between the three instructors, the professor and myself November 4th 1974.

[35] J.Ziman, Public Knowledge: The Social Dimension of Science Cambridge University Press 1968.

[36] Interview with instructor one November 20th 1974.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Interview with instructor two November 15th 1974.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

[42] In group discussion with the three instructors, the professor and myself November 4th 1974.

[43] Interview with instructor two November 15th 1974.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Chapter V section 2b).

[47] Interview with instructor two November 15th 1974.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Basil Bernstein, op. cit.

[55] In group discussion between the three instructors, the professor and myself January 6th 1975.

[56] Interview with instructor three November 27th 1974.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ian Taylor et al op. cit. p. 19.

[61] Ibid. p. 19.

[62] Chapter V section 2.

[63] Interview with instructor three November 27th 1974.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid.

[69] Interview with instructor three February 10th 1975.

[70] Interview with instructor three April 10th 1975.

[71] Interview with instructor one November 20th 1974.

[72] Ibid.

[73] In group discussion between the three instructors, the professor and myself January 6th 1975.

[74] Interview with instructor two November 15th 1974.

[75] A complaint I have heard frequently expressed about such courses by students at this university and in Britain.

[76] Interview with instructor two November 15th 1974.

[77] Ibid.

[78] In group discussion between the three instructors, the professor and myself November 4th 1974.

[79] Ibid.

[80] Ibid.

[81] In group discussion with the three instructors.

[82] Interview with instructor three February 11th 1975.

CHAPTER VI

THE ROLE OF THE INSTRUCTOR AS PRACTISING PEDAGOGUE

Introduction

In the previous chapter I looked at the initial perceptions which the instructors had about the way in which they might teach the course I was investigating.

In this chapter I want to look at what the instructors actually did as practising teachers.

I had intended, originally, to study the activities of only one of the instructors, since I felt, and still feel, that this was the only way in which I could obtain a full and complete understanding of what the instructors were doing in the classroom situation. However the professor wished me to study the activities of all three instructors, and so this I tried to do. Participant observation in the classroom situation was clearly inadequate, and the alternative means I devised, of using student views on what they perceived the pedagogical situation to be, proved impracticable, due to the way each course developed in part, and due to lack of co-operation from at least one instructor.

The data I have used for this chapter, therefore, consists mainly of an interview I conducted with the instructors at the end of the first month of the course; at which time, according to the professor's perceptions of the course, the students should have reached the end of the "ego-centric" or "personal analysis" part of the course; interviews which I conducted with them at weekly intervals thereafter, although I was unable to obtain an interview with instructor two concerning the last week of the course; and a final interview which was conducted after the end of the course.

The data I am using, therefore, to analyse the roles of the instructors as practising pedagogues is nearly all their interpretation of what they were doing. However, having checked this against my own observations, made in each classroom from time to time; and student reports, gathered in "off the record" conversations during the course, in handwritten reports made by some students during the progress of the course, during end of course interviews with a random sample of eight students from each section of the course, and in student questionnaire responses made at the end of the course; I am of the opinion that the discrepancies between instructor interpretations of their role, my interpretations and student interpretations are, for the most part, too minor for me to be concerned with, given the fact that I am interested in a broad classification of how the instructor organised the knowledge he considered valid, what forms of pedagogy he used, and what means of evaluation he used.

One of the points I was looking for was how far the instructors' views as an educationist differed from his praxis as a teacher. In this sense I am viewing the initial perceptions of the instructors, as expressed in the last chapter, as representing an "ought" or "theoretical" perspective; while this chapter represents what they did, and so an "is" or "practical" perspective. As Deutscher has put it:

> No matter what one's theoretical orientation may be, he has no reason to expect to find congruence between attitudes and actions and every reason to expect to find discrepancies between them,[1]

or as he indicates in the title to this article - there is no necessary reason why "words" should be matched by "deeds".

If each instructor had worked within an Emancipatory Code framework then the "words" and "deeds" argument would have been irrelevant. But even if they had, in their initial perceptions of the course, expressed an intention to develop an educational reality within the Emancipatory Code framework it would still need the relevant responses from the students, and a willingness on their part to pursue this perspective, for the instructors to be able to put into practice what they had conceptualised in theory. All of which would call for very special pedagogical skills on the part of the instructors as well as a willingness to respond on the part of the students.

In short, then, there are good reasons for supposing that there might be a lack of congruence between what the instructors perceived they might do and what they actually did.

Lastly, in looking at what each instructor did as a teacher, I shall follow the framework I used for the last chapter by looking at each instructor's role individually and then considering their roles in the light of the theoretical framework I have set up.

Instructor One's Role as a Practising Pedagogue

In his formulation of the curriculum he used in the teaching process, instructor one followed pretty closely what he had thought he would do in his initial perceptions of the curriculum.

He began with a formal presentation of his interpretation of the methodology and areas of knowledge which the various contributing disciplines to the Educational Foundations Department covered. In this, while he was, he claimed, orientating the students to where they were in terms of this course, he was also establishing his own academic credentials in a sense; and indicating that, as he put it "I have powers of reasoning not yet attainable by them".[2] The instructor clearly regarded this as important for the establishment of his authority, and his right to control and define the delimitations of validity in the educational situation.

Having briefly examined the various disciplines which contributed to the Educational Foundations Department, the instructor began what he regarded as the major task of the course: the development of a methodology for the analysis of the quality of arguments, and the suggestion that all arguments can be seen to be imbedded in assumptions about human nature which belong to one of three positions: the "innate", the "physicalist" or the "phenomenological". He defined these three positions as follows: innate "we inherit what is primary", physicalist "environment is primary", phenomenological "neither environment nor heredity (are) primary, both co-exist and interact".[3] In essence though he concentrated on developing the methodology in terms of the physicalist and innate positions because they represented the two extreme positions and, as he remarked at the end of the first month, "I find that people have not had the ability to grasp the end points let alone the middle range (represented by the phenomenological)".[4] Thus, only the last two weeks of the course were really spent on beginning to develop the methodology within the framework of a phenomenological position.

The methodology which the instructor wished the students to learn and utilise in the analysis of their own arguments involved viewing an argument as existing of three parts: a "starting point" or basic assumption which the author makes, whether he explicates it or not, and which can be placed in one of the three categories concerning human nature which I have already described; "an empirical import" by which he meant "what reality does is point to verify itself";[5] and "a theoretical import",[6] by which he meant "what conclusions can be drawn from it".[7]

He had attempted, during the latter part of the first month, tc use this methodology for the analysis of some of the articles in the text book Skolnick and Skolnick,[8] but had been dissatisfied with the results because, "the articles are simply too complicated - they are in essence phenomenclogical".[9]

However, prior to proposing, and attempting to get the students to practice this methodology, he had allowed some general discussions on such concepts as the family,[10] where the differing views on even what could be defined as a family were brought out into the open and remained unresolved. By doing this he was trying to build up a sense of frustration in the students so that "they would recognise that for various non-obvious reasons ther're reaching an impasse in mutual discussions".[11] During the first four weeks after the first month the instructor concentrated on authors he regarded as representing the innate position; beginning with Aristotle and ending with Lorenz, but making reference also to the Roman Catholic Church and using quotations from R.M.Hutchins and M.Rafferty. He, in doing this, used his methodological form of analysis to show the starting point and empirical and theoretical import of each author; and pointed to its implications for education as illustrated by the elitist arguments of R.M.Hutchins and the racist arguments of Jensen.

From here he moved to consider Skinner as representative of the "physicalist" school and then, finally, allowed the students to attempt their own analysis, using his methodology, of an article from Skolnick and Skolnick which he placed in the physicalist school.[12] At the same time he introduced the notion of the "social eye", arguing that none of the three positions he had mentioned took adequate notice of the fact that man is a social animal.[13]

He used this to suggest that "there were very great social repercussions when you began tinkering with social realities"[14] and criticised some of the libertarian movements, whom, he argued, took no account of this fact. At the same time he appears to have rejected the whole notion of social change being achieved by the activities of individuals within a social group. In criticism of Susan Jacoby's article[15] on the formation of a feminist group in a working class district of New York he remarked scornfully:

> What she's doing is unscientific. If you want to change the position of women then you must turn to Skinner and change the cultural agencies.[16]

In summary then, instructor one's curriculum was based on the establishment of a methodology for analysing arguments and the practice of that methodology beginning from the assumption that all arguments can be shown to start from three basic positions concerning human nature, the "physicalist", the "innate" and the "phenomenological". In fact the course was concerned with showing how this methodolcgy might be used to analyse arguments which could be classified as physicalist or innate because the instructor considered arguments taking the phenomenological position as too difficult for the students to analyse. As such "reading materials. . . (were used). . . as illustrative rather than intrinsically educative".[17]

The instructor's pedagogy was only partially supportive of his curriculum, although the complication of having two groups, makes this difficult to talk about.

In his initial perceptions of the course instructor one had said that he wished to have an evening class, if there were students willing to attend, to reduce the size of the day group. Some students, in fact did opt for an evening class of three hours instead of three one hour classes per week. This evening class fluctuated between about ten and fifteen students - it tended to get larger as the term went on - and the instructor clearly treated them pedagogically very differently to the day class, where he had some forty or so students.[18]

The reasons for this were due in part to the fact that the night class was a smaller group and, in the instructor's view, "more homogeneous";[19] in part to the fact that the evening class lasted for three hours; and in part, I suspect, because the instructor expected this group to be the more responsive group.[20]

Basically, in the evening class, the instructor used a form of controlled discussion, where he raised initial questions, laid out the framework within which the discussion should take place and then allowed students to debate amongst themselves, only raising a question or making a point to explicate a situation in terms of his own definitions of validity, or to bring a discussion back within his frame of reference; and seldom gave a formal lecture as such.

In his day class the instructor made much greater use of lecture techniques and of "manipulative gestures not necessary in the night class".[21] This involved taking the contra-positions of certain authors and inviting questions which he then answered within the framework of his own methodology, having classes where he lectured without allowing questions and having other classes where he provided relatively little structure and allowed general class discussion of the topic. All of which he hoped would show "what can be incorporated in one person, utilised in various ways and appreciated in various ways",[22] within, of course, the framework of his methodological analysis.

Only on one occasion did the instructor use small groups and this was in the eleventh week of the thirteen week course, when he formed the day class into groups of three to analyse, using his methodology, an article by Wortis in Skolnick and Skolnick.[23] Having done this in one class the students met as a class next time and discussed each small group's starting point, empirical and theoretical import. The instructor described both classes as excellent and it was probably the only time during the course that student/student dialogue rose above a superficial level. But it was dialogue that was very firmly structured by the limitations on the pedagogical situation specified by the instructor. However he spent the whole of the next week lecturing and the last but one class of the last week was also a lecture, leaving the last class that the instructor had with the students as an open question session.

Thus while his pedagogy with the night class had been largely contolled discussion, with an occasional key lecture, with the day class the instructor used the lecture as a means of pedagogy much more frequently, interspersed with controlled class discussions and one small group interaction class.

His means of evaluation he argued "ties in with the pedagogy by assigning something which cannot be referred back to a reference point in terms of an authority".[24] This of course was not strictly true because the "authority" was himself. As he remarked as a qualification of the two assignments which he asked the students to do:

> _The point is to reason._ You must convince the reader (the instructor) that _your_ personal analysis of yourself and the world is a _valid_ one which gets to the _root_ of what is most _important_ in these areas.[25]

But, by asking for responses in terms of the students' own lives and their views concerning society, it was apparent that the instructor was setting up a situation where any authoritative source could probably only be used to support the student's argument, rather than be incorporated into it. The quality of the argument could still be judged in terms of the methodology of the instructor. As such the evaluation assignment was very cleverly constructed.

The instructor also gave, as part of his evaluation, an examination at the end of the course. His views on examinations were stated clearly in the final interview: "the notion of an examination is appropriate for any course as a terminal summary".[26] But again his main concern was that students should display the capacity to practice the methodology he had taught them; that they should be able to demonstrate a successful socialisation into his frames of reference.

This is where I shall leave my discussion of instructor one's role as a practising pedagogue and move on to consider instructor two's role in this function.

Instructor Two's Role as a Practising Pedagogue

Instructor two never formulated his own objectives for the course in the manner of instructor one, and so never achieved his consistency in terms of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Added to this the instructor on numerous occasions indulged himself in the rhetoric of the educationist and made it very difficult for the students to move into his frame of reference. Perhaps if I quote what he had expected to cover in month one according to his course outline it will make my point clear:

> Month I - Examination of Self
> 1. Schools of Thought - Freudian, Gestalt, Piagetian, Behavioristic, Humanistic.
> 2. Analytical Tools - Validity?
> 3. Personal Work (e.g. possibly an individual trait inventory).
> 4. Other Models for Ego-Integration, e.g. Kohlberg, Erickson, etc.
> 5. Experience - Literature as ego analytic, Film as ego analytic, Music etc.
> 6. Personality to Characterology - What traits do I share with others? Which are socially defined, culturally defined?[27]

He said of his approach to curriculum that "it was a synchronic development of philosophy, technology and political science through a synthesis of theory, practice, value and politics".[28] Be this as it may, chronologically he spent the first month mainly on "the meaning of this (i.e. his) approach and the methodological concerns for the course".[29] In doing this he used a framework for the development of explanations as moving from mythological through religious and philosophical to scientific. In doing this he used arguments and data from authors such as Nagel[30] and Kuhn,[31] developing a theme which he described as "holism, interdisciplinary studies, a smattering from all the sciences being somewhat vulgarised".[32] In doing this he was trying to lay down his teacher defined limitations of what was to be treated as valid knowledge in the course; while at the same time, establishing his authority in terms of a superior intellectual understanding and capacity to handle ideas.

In terms of establishing his right, intellectually, to teach the students he was, perhaps, reasonably successful; but in doing this he used the restricted linguistic code forms associated with the various intellectual positions he was espousing, and assumed a prior understanding of the authors he was discussing, to such an extent that most students appeared totally bewildered and frustrated. This bewilderment and frustration never completely disappeared and instructor two was never able to move his students into his frame of reference in the same manner as instructor one.

The rest of the course was mainly spent in explicating and discussing three psychological models of human development drawn from the works of Erickson, Friedenberg and Hampden-Turner, and their relevance to the students in the class, with the last two weeks taken up with small group presentations, of which I shall say more later.

In dealing with these psychological models the instructor made a formal presentation of his interpretation of what the various authors had said, and described ways in which they could be used as forms of "ego analysis". This was then followed by class discussions, and sometimes small group discussions, of certain questions which the instructor regarded as important, during which the instructor attempted to deal also with various questions and responses from certain members of the class. Since the full complement of this section was well over sixty students, and since there were normally at least forty students present in any one class, only a small proportion of the students, in any one class, actually spoke; and, as is the tendency in classes of such a size, verbal responses become the prerogative, for the most part, of a vocal minority. These discussions often became heated and strayed from the point which the instructor had initially tried to make. The classic case of this, that occurred while I was present in the classroom, developed out of the discussion of Hampden-Turner's model of human development.[33] In presenting this model the instructor used a table that Hampden-Turner had developed, utilising the differing responses a researcher had obtained from R.O.T.C. students and student draft resisters at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, to demonstrate how much better the draft resisters fitted into his model of active, creative, caring, "radical" man than did the R.O.T.C. students.[34] The class then became embroiled in a heated argment concerning the relative merits of R.O.T.C. and draft resisting students; an argument which, I suspect, would not have occurred either in Eastern Canada, Europe or in any of the major city universities in the U.S.A., but I shall say more of this elsewhere; and the question of categorising people into types; so that the whole point of the exercise, which I presume was to examine the qualities that Hampden-Turner regarded as "good", was lost.[35] In fact, although the instructor spent some time at the beginning of the next class explicating the differences he perceived between "typological" thinking, in which he argued "all realities are entities in fixed categories", of which he accused the students in the previous class; and "statistical" thinking, in which there is "a quantitative distribution of entities into classes by statistics in probable categories", and attacked the techniques used to collect the data which Hampden-Turner drew upon; at no point did he go back to consider exactly what the qualities were that Hampden-Turner was describing as good.[36]

I have spent some time on this example because it highlights a continuing incompatibility between student and teacher definitions of the educational situation which, in part, account for the inconsistincies in the instructor's approach to his curriculum.

The last two weeks of the course were given over to student presentations, both individual and group, which were largely unrestricted in the content they might use,although the instructor suggested that they might build on some of the readings done during the course, use a film as a springboard for discussion, or use a weltanschaung game format which he had devised. However the instructor did lay down certain conditions which each presentation should attempt to meet:

> Firstly to expand the class's perspective - epistemology.
> Secondly to incorporate innovative methods - pedagogy.
> Thirdly to point the way to the actualisation of content through a praxis of theory, practice, value and politics.[37]

Also he added that each presentation should be ten minutes long and there would be ten minutes of class analysis.[38]

In these presentations the instructor was asking students to imitate what he, at least theoretically, had attempted to do.

In terms of curriculum, then, this instructor attempted to develop his own version of a scientific method, use psychological models of human behaviour to illustrate how this method was used, and then had students develop their own curricula, in their presentations, utilising some of the criteria of this methodology.

In his pedagogy this instructor used mainly lecture and teacher controlled discussions, intending that the lectures should define the valid delimitations of the learning situation. In fact, because he often failed to make clear to the students exactly what these delimitations were, the discussions often strayed outside his defined limits of validity and he found himself having to make subsidiary qualifications and justifications of his initial statements. Only in the last two weeks of the course did he allow students to exercise any control over the pedagogy and, while there was some emphasis on dialogue through the making of presentations to the rest of the class, since an individual, or group depending upon personal preferences, made a presentation to the rest of the class; with a time allotment of ten minutes for presentation and ten minutes for analysis, it must have been at a very superficial level. Although the time allotment was, in fact, considerably increased, the dialogue that I saw in my two visits[39] during this two week period was at a superficial level.

Evaluation had initially involved amongst other things, the writing of a personal diary at the end of each month with, as its components, a description of the learner's personal existential realities and a course progress report. This diary, as the instructor put it,

> Should contain a well based logic - internally consistent. . . It should contain some theorizing about your experiences and thoughts. Hopefully

> this would follow from some of the methodology of argument presented in class.[40]

However, after the first month's work had been handed in it was clear that, although there were many interesting observations in the diaries, the students had not carried out the type of analysis the instructor had hoped for, combined with which he found it very difficult to achieve the impersonality as an evaluator which he had felt he wished to achieve.[41] Therefore he dropped the diary as a means of evaluation for institutional purposes. He did, however, use nearly all the other original means of evaluation and added to them an examination and a report on their presentation by the students. Amongst these were what he termed a "model for thought analysis" where, sketching in outline the methodology which he had been putting forward in the course, he asked the students to use this methodology to "plug-in" either:

> a) An influential writer-artist in your life.
> b) Any named thinker in the course.
> c) Another individual you wish accommodated.[42]

For the examination he assigned a group of readings as a content base and conceptual framework for the questions he would ask. All these readings were from the area of Anthropology and yet could be described as cross-cultural in their perspective, since they all dealt with differences between cultures, without attempting to formulate ethnocentric value judgments; except for, perhaps, the article by Lorenz[43] which attempted to lay down some fundamental human characteristics. Perhaps more important, for my purposes, the instructor provided a brief precis of the articles pointing out what he considered the important points in the articles, so that students would be able to glean how they should be interpreted within his framework of defined reality.

This is where I shall leave my discussion of the role of instructor two as a practising pedagogue and proceed to look at how instructor three performed this role.

Instructor Three's Role as a Practising Pedagogue

Instructor three never developed the type of personal commitment to teaching the course that the other instructors did and regarded himself as doing things with which he did not agree and which he would have preferred to do a different way. His concern in setting up his curriulum, pedagogy and evaluation, was firstly to carry out what he perceived as the wishes of the professor. There was then a continuing tension between what he was, he felt, expected to do by the professor and what he would have liked to do in the teaching of the course. This tension was apparent in his practice of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation.

In his formulation of the curriculum the instructor used the framework of three units which the professor had suggested, (he was in fact the only instructor to actually do so) although he was only able to spend three weeks on the third "ecumenical" unit.

As he suggested he would prior to the beginning of the course, the instructor,[44] for the first two units of the course, relied on topics derived from student statements of what they thought should be discussed in the course. To categorise these statements he asked students to write them down, collected them and sorted them into, what he considered represented, six major topics of interest, with, where appropriate, subdivisions for questions which come within sub headings of each topic.[45] At the same time he divided the class up into groups of five to six people, according to, for the main part, the topic interest which they had evinced, thus forming eleven groups in all.

The instructor's first unit consisted of class discussions of each of the six topics; which he led, but did not consciously attempt to dominate. In this unit, although the instructor made occasional reference to articles as a stimulus for discussion, he intended students to present their own personal views in the classroom situation.[46]

In the second unit he retained the topics of the first unit, but based the curriculum in this unit on presentations made by students form six of his eleven small groups, according to the initial interests he had specified. In this unit he wished students to "concentrate on the literature with an emphasis on research findings rather than their own personal views. . . research representing cross-cultural findings".[47] To achieve this the instructor assigned a list of readings covering each of the topics which he wished all students to read, and the students making presentations, to utilise in their presentations. In fact there was some confusion here and several of the groups, certainly, did not use the assigned readings in their group presentations in the manner intended by the instructor.

In the third unit the instructor centred his curriculum round five articles drawn from the area of the sociology of education which he argued dealt with "consciousness raising" issues in relation to Canadian society, Canadian education, and Education in general".[48] He described this unit as "highly theoretical" and said "at that theoretical level I don't know whether you (the students) can produce a presentation".[49] However he intended that each group which had not already made a presentation should lead the discussion of these articles. He had hoped that there would be small group discussion for about half the class before they came together for a class discussion , led by the presenting group. But by the second week of unit three he decided this was not happening "because the articles were so difficult" and so determined to introduce the article himself and let the group continue the discussion at a class level. In fact on most occasions he had to take full charge of the discussion, which was preceded by a lecture from him.

In terms of curriculum, then, the instructor, for the first two units, used the topics developed from student interests expressed at the beginning of the course. However in the second unit he began to define the learning process by assigning particular articles related to these topics as readings. In the third unit he went one step further and used readings he assigned as the curriculum, thereby totally defining what was valid knowledge.

In terms of pedagogy the instructor began with large class discussions in which he appeared to play an important role, at least in the three classes that I observed, and according to what students told me; so that most of the time the discussion took the form of a dialogue between the instructor and various individual members of the class.

In the second unit some small group interaction took place and the students exercised an increased control over the pedagogical process, both through their group presentations to the class and through the resultant class discussions in which the instructor took a relatively minor part. In the third unit however the instructor greatly increased his control over the pedagogical situation through his use of lecture and his control of classroom discussion. In this regard it should be pointed out that he had defined the curriculum and was generally accepted as the expert knower in terms of this curriculum. At the same time, though, his increased intervention and control over the pedagogical situation arose also, in part, through the inability or unwillingness of groups of students to enter the instructor's frame of reference and lead class discussions themselves.

In terms of evaluation this instructor was the only one to allow students to carry out any form of self-evaluation for grading purposes, despite his grave misgivings about it. Their self-evaluations counted for about twenty-five percent of the total course evaluation. This self-evaluation counted for fifty percent of the first unit and thirty percent of the second and third units course work.

The forms of evaluation that the instructor used were very varied. They included the keeping of a diary, which was in the form of a precis of the course; a monthly self-evaluation of the course in terms of what the course had meant to the student; a group presentation, where a mark was given for the whole group; and a final examination, which contained one compulsory question asking for an evaluation of the course, one compulsory question, set and marked by the professor, asking for students to develop a one year teaching programme to implement his initial perceptions of the course, and another question which could be chosen from a selection which generally dealt with the third level of the course.

With these comments I shall end my brief descriptions of the role of the instructors as practising pedagogues and move on to consider how these roles can be assessed within the framework of educational knowledge codes.

The Roles of the Instructors as Practising Pedagogues, and Educational Knowledge Codes

I have already remarked in the previous chapter[50] that, in my opinion, none of the instructors had conceptualised the course in terms which bore much relation to, either the professor's initial perceptions of the form the course might take, or an Emancipatory Code situation. Neither did they, in their practice of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation, move far towards an Emancipatory Code situation.

There were similarities between what instructors one and two did in the pedagogical situation which classified both of them as teaching within an Integrated Code frame of reference.

Both instructors began their courses with a series of lectures in which instructor one said that he was placing the course within the framework of the disciplines available in the Educational Foundations Department and explicating the framework of his methodology for the analysis of arguments; and instructor two stated that he was "orienting the students to the meaning of this approach and the methodolcgical concerns for the course".[51] In doing this the two instructors were establishing their authority to teach their students in terms of their greater expertise and understandings, in other words establishing their authority on an interpersonal rather than positional basis; while, at the same time, laying out the delimitations of what whould be considered as valid knowledge in terms of the course, in other words establishing teacher defined educational realities which any student, to be successful in terms of evaluation, must become socialised into; and also presenting the integrating idea, i.e. their methodology and methodolcgical positions, which would cut across traditionally Collection Code definitions of discrete areas of educational knowledge.

Instructor one appeared relatively successful in socialising most of his students, at least partially into his frame of reference; but instructor two found this very much more difficult, for reasons that I have already touched upon. This led to a continuing tension between student and instructor definitions of what was valid knowledge. As the instructor remarked at the end of the first month:

> I'm just getting them over their own antagonisms towards themselves, towards alienation here, towards me, simply tc work in some commonality before I can draw on them to get some of their inputs.[52]

Similarly the conflict over Hampden-Turner's use of research based on R.O.T.C. and draft resister students at Berkeley University, to which I have already alluded,[53] is an example of the difficulty the instructor experienced, in imposing his own definitions of valid knowledge upon student perceived realities; a difficulty which led to several classes being spent by the instructor explaining how "wrong" interpretations by the students of what he was presenting were causing misunderstandings, and how different, i.e. his, interpretations would allow students to enter his defined educational realities. This is, of course what he was doing in the explanation of "statistical" as opposed to "categorical" thinking.

Because of the clarity of his presentations, and the simplicity of the idea he used as the basis for his methodolcgy, instructor one did not encounter the same difficulties.

Both instructors were mainly concerned with the ability of their students to duplicate the type of methodological analysis which they had develcped, and each provided time within the course for this to be practiced, albeit a brief amount of time. Instructor one provided a week where students specifically analysed the Wortis article in terms of his methodology, and instructor two provided two weeks for student presentations which were to duplicate what he hoped he had done in a more limited fashion. In this sense the amount of time allowed students to work actively, practising the skills considered relevant, within teacher definitions of educational reality, was considerably less than one might have expected, given that the instructors were working within an Integrated Code framework. In my opinion this was partly due to the insecurity of the instructors' positions as legitimised university teachers; partly due to their own prior university experiences, where such activities were associated with academically ill-regarded courses; partly due to the large classes they had to teach, where students involved in their own work would, perforce, have to work in groups, receive little supervision and so might easily move outside the teacher defined educational realities;[54] and partly due to a lack of prior pedagogical experience where students had been treated as active learners rather than passive receivers of knowledge,[55] i.e. their own experiences under Collection Code situations. Similarly both instructors made it clear, in the means of evaluation that were utilised, that students must enter their (the instructors') frames of reference in formulating their answers, and the extent to which they were able to do so, in the opinion of the instructors, would be reflected in the grade level they received. Instructor two did, prior to the beginning of the course,[56] express some concern about the problem of integrating an evaluation based on cognitive and dispositional attributes, but, apart from finding it impossible to grade the diaries, found no problems in the practice of evaluation, in this regard; and instructor one argued that he would defend his authority to grade the student on the grounds of his superior knowledge and understanding of what he had asked the student to do,[57] thus supporting his positional authority by means of his interpersonal power to intellectually dominate the learner. Therefore, although they both used an examination as part of their means of evaluation, and I have argued that an examination is a mode of evaluation more suited to a Collection Code, since that examination was the relatively smaller part of the evaluation, and since the students were still required to respond in terms of teacher defined realities, I think it fair to say that the means of evaluation remained firmly within an Integrated Code format. In this regard I should add a word concerning instructor two's examination. This examination was based on readings taken solely from the area of Anthropology, and so it might be argued that, in content and in the assumptions required, they reflect a Collection Code. However I should point out that the instructor, by providing a precis of each article indicating the points and questions he wished the students to consider, was, to some extent at least, defining what was to be considered valid knowledge in those articles. Added to which Anthropology can, to some extent, be considered, by definition, as cross-disciplinary, since the boundaries of its subject matter are not clearly delineated.

As I have already suggested instructor three did not have a similar personal commitment to what he was doing, in the manner of instructors one and two. I have already alluded to this but it is worthwhile, I think, to indicate further instances where the instructor suggested this fact.

In his description of the course in its ninth week the instructor remarked that "students are very sceptical of the kind of thing he's (i.e. the professor) doing",[58] referring to the objectives of the course, as specified by the professor, as he (the instructor) perceived them. The interesting point is that, although the instructor was teaching the course, he was dissociating himself from its format. Again during a discussion at the end of the course the instructor argued that the course was

> trying to change consciousness without changing the material conditions of the society. Is it worthwhile then? . . .some students said they preferred traditional methods.[59]

And as he stated in the final interview "if given a free hand I would opt for the traditional approach . . .(with). . . the lecture method acting as a framework".[60]

The problem this raises in terms of educational knowledge codes is that a pre-requisite for successful teaching in Integrated or Emancipatory Code situations is a sense of personal commitment, on the part of the teacher, to what he is doing. This is not so important in Collection Code situations where the knowledge is defined in terms of the ontological realities of the discipline, but it is important when operating under the other two codes, because lack of commitment on the part of the teacher will normally result in lack of commitment on the part of the learner. This is due to the fact that, under both Integrated and

Emancipatory Codes, there must be developed a sense of trust between teacher and learners. This sense of trust is necessary because, under Integrated Codes, the learners, to learn successfully, must totally enter the learning world of the teacher; while, under Emancipatory Codes, the learners, in the initial stages of the learning process, must allow the teacher to guide them towards the demystification of their personal and social worlds through a reflective understanding of their existential realities. It will, at times, be a painful process and requires a realisation by the learner of the strong sense of personal commitment on the part of the teacher to, not only help the learners examine their realities, but also to re-examine his own realities in the light of what he learns from his learners.

Having said all this, at one point in the course instructor three moved closer towards what the professor had envisaged the course should be, and towards an Emancipatory Code situation, than either of the other two instructors.

Although the instructor sought out and utilised self-expressed student interests as a framework for the first two units of the course, these interests or topic areas were minimally related to the immediate existential realities of the learners, with the possible exception of the topic "sex roles in society". Most of the topics were, in fact, related to future roles they would take as teachers and, as such, reflected the strongly instrumental attitudes of the students, which I have commented on previously.

The use of class discussion as the pedagogical frameword for unit one led to classroom situations where discussion usually went through the instructor, in the form of a dialogue. This reflected, in part, the unconscious reliance by the instructor on pedagogical techniques he was familiar with as a university teacher previously; in part, the reluctance of many students to engage in student/student dialogue in large class discussion situations; and, in part, a lack of interest, on the part of many students, in some of the topics discussed. However, whatever the reasons, it did create an educational situation where, in practice, the instructor exercised considerable control over what was taken as valid knowledge, through the control he exercised over the pedagogical situation. Thus the instructor was operating within an Integrated Code mode.

In unit two the instructor, using the same topics as a framework, gave more power to the students in the pedagogical relationship by allowing them to work in small groups and make some presentations of group viewpoints on the topics to be discussed, with these presentations then becoming the focal point for class discussion. In doing this students were able, to some extent at least, to define what would be valid knowledge through their presentations. Although the instructor tried to use scheduled reading assignments as a means of defining what should be accepted as valid knowledge, in my view the second unit represented a significant shift of control in the pedagogical relationship from instructor to students, and it did appear, at least in some student groups, that they were beginning to develop an inner dynamic and the beginnings of a helical synergy through the use of dialectic and dialogue. Certainly the students with whom I spoke felt that this was the most successful and worthwhile part of the course for them, both at a group level and at a class level. In unit two, then, the instructor began pedagogically to move towards an Emanicpatory Code situation.

The instructor's sudden move, therefore, to a Collection Code situation in unit three, where students had to enter a world of sociological understandings and assumptions, clearly created problems for the students and the instructor. As the instructor remarked, "they find it very difficult to understand the theoretical arguments",[61] and he found it necessary to increase his input into the pedagogical situation, which he had originally intended to be still relatively small, although increased as compared to unit two. In fact he found it necessary to exercise much more control over the pedagogical situation, including the giving of lectures on occasions, to define and interpret the knowledge which he regarded as valid.[62]

I have described the move, in terms of the curriculum, in unit three as a move to a Collection Code form. Given this it is not surprising the form of pedagogy also changed. However, since neither instructor nor students seem to have been aware that they had moved into a situation where implicit pre-understandings exist governing the possible interpretations of educational situations; and the Collection Code form within which they were working, the sociology of education, has relatively weak "frames"[63] in terms of its relationship to community, so far as its subject matter is concerned - its methodology represents a rather different picture; it is possible to see unit three as representing a position pedagogically between Collection and Integrated Code forms. Thus, in the view of both instructor and students, the students were required to come to terms with the teacher's rather than the discipline's defined realities. However, in understanding the instructor's frame of reference, it was necessary for the students to achieve some understanding of the ontological realities of the discipline.

In the methods of evaluation the instructor used there was, again, a complicated situation as viewed in relation to educational knowledge codes.

In the assignment of twenty percent of the overall evaluation to student self-evaluation, we can see a move towards an Emancipatory Code, where learners evaluate themselves. Although, for any evaluation to be truly emancipatory it should be essentially personal and not evaluation within the framework of institutionally assignated forms. Combined with which one would have expected students to have an increasing participation in their evaluation under an Emancipatory Code, whereas in fact they were responsible for the evaluation of fifty percent of the course work for unit one but only thirty percent of units two and three, which in themselves carried a larger percentage of the overall evaluation as well.

In terms of the rest of the evaluation, the picture is very confused. If a group made a presentation in the second unit, as did six of the eleven groups, then each member of that group was given a group mark for their presentations by the convenor. If, however, students had not made a presentation in unit two then they wrote an essay on one of six titles given by the instructor, covering each of the six topics covered in that unit. Since the topics were cross disciplinary in nature, and since the convenor set the titles and evaluated the presentations on his own, this section of the evaluation represented an Integrated Code form. Added to this the diary and the student evaluation written by the students and evaluated at the end of each month represent an Emancipatory Code form. However the other evaluation for the third unit, like the curriculum and pedagogy, represents a move towards a Collection Code form. Thus, the student groups, who had not already made a presentation, supposedly led the discussions on each of the assigned readings, while those who had already made presentations wrote an essay critically examining one of the articles considered in class. In either case the work was done and evaluated in terms of the ability of the students to comprehend the articles within the given frameworks of the sociology of education, and so ultimately represented evaluation within the Collection Code form. The final examination, however, was of a type which required evaluation in the Integrated Code form, although in the third question, which, unlike the first two, could be selected from a choice of four questions, two of the questions were from unit three and two from unit two. It was the only examination to include a question from the professor, as one of the two compulsory questions, and the only one which was a take-home examination.

Summary

In this chapter I have looked at the way in which the instructors set about actually teaching the course to which they were assigned and analysed their curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation in terms of the educational knowledge codes I have posited.

As such instructors one and two clearly operated within the framework of an Integrated Code, although their own prior biographical experience, and the large size of their classes, made them pursue a pedagogy at times more appropriate to a Collection Code form.

The failure of instructor three to develop an interpretation of the professor's ideas to which he could feel any sense of personal commitment, made it very difficult for him to operate successfully within the framework of either Integrated or Emancipatory Codes. Thus he merely attempted to implement what he perceived as the professor's perceptions of the course. In unit two this did in fact, for some students in terms of the pedagogical relationship, produce a movement towards an Emanicpatory Code form. However a misinterpretation of the professor's perception of the third or ecumenical level led the instructor to perceive it as meaning merely developing a theoretical perspective. He then went to his own area of specialisation for that theoretical perspective and so moved, in terms of curriculum, towards a Collection Code form. This, in turn, necessitated a move pedagogically to a Collection Code form to accommodate the new curriculum form.

In the next chapter I shall move on from the instructors to consider briefly the students and their reactions to the course of which they were a part.

FOOTNOTES

[1] J.Deutscher, "Words and Deeds: Social Science and Social Policy", Social Problems Volume 13 1966 (Winter) p. 247.

[2] Interview with instructor one February 11 th 1975.

[3] Descriptions used in class hand-out March 1975.

[4] Interview with instructor one February 11th 1975.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

[8] E.S.Skolnick and J.H.Skolnick, eds. Intimacy, Family and Society Little, Brown and Co. 1974.

[9] Interview with instructor one February 11th 1975.

[10] In the "day" class January 24th 1975.

[11] Interview with instructor one February 11th 1975.

[12] R.P.Wortis, "The Acceptance of the Concept of the Maternal Role by Behavioral Scientists: Its Effects on Women" in Skolnick and Skolnick op. cit. pp.360-76.

[13] Interview with instructor one March 31st 1975.

[14] Ibid.

[15] S.Jacoby, "What Do I Do for the Next Twenty Years" in Skolnick and Skolnick op. cit. pp226-36.

[16] In the "day" class March 24th 1975.

[17] Interview with instructor one February 11th 1975.

[18] All the classes were considerably larger than the professor had predicted, so that none of the instructors' sections had less than sixty students in them.

[19] Interview with instructor one February 11th 1975.

[20] Interview with instructor one November 20th 1974.

[21] Interview with instructor one February 11th 1975.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Wortis, op. cit.

[24] Interview with instructor one February 11th 1975.

[25] Course assignment instructions to students in instructor one's section.

[26] Interview with instructor one July 30th 1975.

[27] Course outline given to students at the beginning of the course.

[28] Interview with instructor two April 2nd 1975.

[29] Interview with instructor two February 11th 1975.

[30] e.g. E.Nagel, The Structure of Science Harcourt, Brace and World Inc. 1961.

[31] Thomas S.Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions University of Chicago Press 1962.

[32] Interview with instructor two February 11th 1975.

[33] As explicated by Hampden-Turner in Charles Hampden-Turner, Radical Man Anchor Books 1971.

[34] Ibid. Table 41 pp.466-7.

[35] In class March 10th 1975.

[36] In class March 12th 1975.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Classes of March 26th and March 31st 1975.

[40] Instructions regarding the personal diary assignment.

[41] Interview with instructor two November 15th 1975.

[42] Instructions regarding the "model for thought

analysis" assignment.

[43] Conrad Lorenz, "Genetic Decay" in *Intellectual Digest* April 1974.

[44] Interview with instructor three November 27th 1974.

[45] These were as follows:
"1.The influence of the home, family and peer group on the socialization process of the child....
2.Teacher-pupil interaction....
3.Sex roles in society....
4.Religions and moral education in schools.
5.The role of a teacher.
6.Canadian native Indians"
from Instructor's hand-out *Topics for Discussion at the Egocentric Level.*

[46] Interview with instructor three february 10th 1975.

[47] Interview with instructor three February 14th 1975.

[48] Instructor outline of unit three.
The articles upon which was based this unit were:
"1. Melvin Watkins, *Education in the Branch Plant Economy*
2.M.S.Archer, and M.Vaughan, *Domination and Assertion in Educational Systems*
3.Ralph H.Turner, *Modes of Social Ascent Through Education*
4.W.D.Hrychuk, *The New World Begins Where You Are*
5.John A.Porter, *Social Change and the Aims and Problems of Education in Canada*
from *instructor outline for unit three.*

[49] In class March 5th 1975.

[50] Chapter V.

[51] Interview with instructor two February 11th 1975.

[52] Evaluation meeting held February 7th 1975 with the three instructors, the professor and myself present.

[53] Chapter VI, section 2.

[54] In this regard instructor one, during the Evaluation meeting op. cit., made it clear that he would accept much more student participation in his small evening class than he would in his large day class.

[55] This applies, in particular, to instructor one.

[56] Interview with instructor two November 15th 1974.

[57] Interview with instructor one February 11th 1975.

[58] Interview with instructor March 7th 1975.

[59] Post-course Evaluation meeting between the three instructors, the professor and myself April 30th 1975.

[60] Interview with instructor three April 10th 1975.

[61] Interview with instructor three March 21st 1975.

[62] As indicated in his interpretations of the assigned readings listed in footnote [48].

[63] Bernstein, op. cit.

CHAPTER VII

THE STUDENTS AS KNOWLEDGE RECEIVERS

Introduction

The students in the three sections of the course I was investigating represent the final recipients of the ideas of the professor and the instructors. As such their judgements on the course reflect the end point of the pedagogical process which began with the professor. But their judgements and understandings will, in turn, be influenced by their own biographical processes.

Therefore, in considering the student orientations towards, and perceptions of, the course it is necessary to examine these biographical processes to gain some understanding of the prior understandings which they brought into the course.

The data for this chapter was collected, in the main, from two questionnaires which were given to students in the three sections, one biographical[1] and one concerned specifically with the course they were taking,[2] and from interviews with eight students from each section, selected by stratified random sample techniques, concerning their views on the course.[3]

The two questionnaires elicited about a sixty percent overall response from the students in the three sections, but the level of response varied from section to section. Thus student responses in sections one and three involved about sixty five percent of each class, while responses from section two measured only fifty percent of the whole class. Since these questionnaires were handed out in specific classes they therefore represent the number of students present in the one class.

The Biographical Background of the Students

The information which I have used in the writing of this section is taken, for the most part, from the biographical questionnaire to which the students in the three sections responded.*

Some sixty-eight percent of the respondents were female, representing roughly the equivalent number of students in the sections who were female. While fifty-nine percent of the students came from urban centres and forty-one percent from rural communities or farms. This, of course, represents the continuing importance of rural life in this province, despite the development of two major urban centres in the last thirty years.

In terms of father's occupation fifty-three percent of the students came from white collar or professional occupational backgrounds and nineteen percent from farming backgrounds. Since farmers, in this province at least, share many of the political beliefs of the bourgeoisie it is fair to say, I think, that at least seventy-two percent of the students came from backgrounds where the bourgeois ideology of competitive individualism is implicit in the pre-understandings of the family. This, combined with the fact that the school experience of these students was judged mainly on like criteria of competitive individualism, brings students to university with a predilection for an education based on such principles. McLeish has suggested, in this regard, that students intending to be teachers are likely to be more conservative in their attitudes and political allegiances.[5] The professor also found, using an adapted version of the Adorno et al "Authoritarian Personality Test",[6] that the vast majority of the students held attitudes which could be described as authoritarian, thus reflecting an inherent conservatism amongst the students. However I should add that I have grave doubts about the efficacy of the test which was used and about the conditions under which this test was carried out.

The level of parental education reflects the great expansion in educational opportunities in Canada over the last fifteen years or so. Thus only fifty-four percent of the students' mothers and fathers had attained grade twelve education and only thirty-seven percent of either parents had attended a university themselves. Almost two thirds of the students, then, were first generation university students. Such students, I would suggest, are more likely to seek, and place importance upon, the judgements of their peers with regard to the courses they will take. In such circumstances the prior reputation of a course may well be an important factor in prior student orientations towards that course. However I shall say more of this in the next section.

Although only twenty-three percent of the students had a parent who had been, or still was, in the teaching profession, forty-nine percent had either close friends or relations in the teaching profession. Thus seventy-two percent of these students had some strong personal links with members of the teaching profession. Such a group of practising members of the teaching profession may well exert an important informal influence on such students, suggesting the need for a more practical orientation in their courses and questioning theoretical perspectives of a more radical nature.

The current controversy over the new social studies curriculum programme represents one area of potential conflict between teacher and university orientations to the school curriculum, despite the fact that the curriculum originated from the work of practising teachers and is the brain-child of the Department of Education rather than the university. I mention this because, at least in the professor's perceptions of the course, there was an intention that the course I investigated should contain a praxiological element which would radically alter the nature of the teacher's rôle in the classroom. I would suggest, therefore, that the biographical background of the students would lead one to expect them to espouse a position which, at least implicitly, supports a competitive individualism, coming as they do largely from the bourgeoisie and a school system founded on Collection Code principles; together with a fundamental political conservatism, in part due to their bourgeois family background, but also due to the conservatism rife in the province as a whole; and a tendency towards a desire for courses which can be seen as instrumental in the narrow professional training sense - the result of the influence of practising members of the teaching profession.

The Students as Knowledge Receivers

The data on which this section is based is taken from the responses to the questionnaire concerning the course administered during the last two weeks of the course,[7] and from the eight students in each section who were interviewed during the same time period.[8]

Perhaps the most disturbing finding I came across in the analysis of this data concerned the general prior reputation this course had amongst students who took it in the three sections I investigated. Fifty-six percent of the students surveyed had heard bad reports of the course, thirty-one percent had heard nothing about the course, and thirteen percent had heard that it would be in the area of the history or philosophy of education. However, no student had, apparently, heard a good word about the course.

Combined with this bad reputation it was also often stated that students had heard that the course was "easy", i.e. you did not have to do much work for it. Add to this the almost unanimous view of the students that the course was a compulsory one for their programme,[9] i.e. a forced attendance, and you have a situation which even the most experienced teacher might view with some trepidation.

The problem with such prior orientations is that; if students have difficulty in understanding the subject matter, if they are confused by short-term organisational problems, or if they do not find other students or the instructor immediately responsive to their suggestions; they are more likely to see these as fulfilments of their prior expectations rather than short-term difficulties to be overcome by application and understanding on the part of the student.

In short, with such expectations, students are much more likely to be critical of any short-comings they perceive in the course, and much more likely to reject all of the course because of the short-comings of a particular part of it. When the belief that a reasonable grade can be obtained without doing much work is added to this; the ultimately poor, but in the short-term perhaps useful, motivational force of the grade-point-average perspective disappears. I am not suggesting that the problem of such prior orientations are insurmountable, far from it, and I think all instructors to some extent were able to overcome them; but they do make the instructor's job immeasurably more difficult than it might otherwise be.

It would appear, from the interviews which I conducted,[10] that students taking this course are, at the same time, happy with their university experiences as a whole and regard them so far as both useful and interesting. We cannot then, I think, write off negative prior attitudes to this course as reflecting merely part of a general dissatisfaction with university life.

In terms of what actually went on in their sections, nearly all the students interviewed were of the opinion that the course I investigated was radically different from the other courses they were currently taking. All but three of the students I interviewed stated that the rest of their courses consisted mainly of the provision of new factual information through the pedagogical medium of a lecture, while they all agreed that the main emphasis in this course had been on learning how to use knowledge and/or develop the ability to argue logically. This reflects, of course, a major differentiation between courses in a Collection and Integrated Code form.

To obtain student views on the form of pedagogy which they felt most suitable for a course where the emphasis was on the use of knowledge, the question was asked, in the questionnaire, "What kind of teaching/learning situation do you find best for: a) making you think? b) providing you with information?" In response to part a) virtually all students opted for some form of discussion for at least part of the time, while only fifteen percent of the students regarded the use of a lecture as functional in this regard.

However there is some inconsistency, apparently, in the responses dealing with the teaching methods the students regarded as best for this course, or students I interviewed were not representative of the general student views on this matter. Thus twenty five percent of instructor one's respondents, all from his day class, sixty percent of instructor two's respondents and twenty five percent of instructor three's respondents, thought that the lecture should be an integral pedagogical part of the course. But there does seem to be some evidence to suggest that, in responding to the question, "which teaching method or methods do you think would be best for this course?",[12] the students were thinking largely in terms of the pedagogy used in the teaching of their particular section, e.g. group work, which was used only on two occasions in section one, was not mentioned as a possible pedagogy by any respondents in that group, while twenty percent of the students in section two, where it was used on three or four occasions and also for the preparation of presentations, regarded it as one or the possible pedagogies and forty-five percent of section three, where it was widely used in the second unit of that course, mentioned it. Added to which another twenty percent of this section (three) mentioned the use of presentations.

Since only two of the group which mentioned group work also mentioned presentations as a possible pedagogy under this question, it seems reasonable to suppose that the real figure for the use of group work as a means of pedagogy is in fact something closer to fifty-five percent for section three. It is significant here that, although so few students from sections one and two mentioned group work as a form of pedagogy which should be utilised in this course, in the questionnaire, in their discussions with me, during interviews, the vast majority of the students from both sections regarded more small group work as one of the improvements which should be made to the course.[13] There is the alternative possibility that I unconsciously imposed my own pedagogical preferences upon students being interviewed by asking "leading" questions. But if this is so, I think, having listened to the tape recordings of the interviews,[14] that it only happened in a minority of cases. Certainly not enough times to explain the discrepancy between student responses in the questionnaires and student responses in the interviews.

In short, then, I am inclined to believe questionnaire responses which suggest that some form of discussion is an important factor in a course concerned with developing thought processes, rather than simply passing on information; and from responses obtained in interviews, I would suggest that many students feel that such discussion is best organised through small group interaction.[15]

As well as, perhaps, wanting more small group interaction, the vast majority of the students regarded their class sizes as far too large. The vast majority of students wanted classes of below thirty; and all instructor one's evening class, itself numbering between twelve and fifteen, opted for a class size of under fifteen, as did forty-five percent of his day class, who were aware of the evening class activities.[16]

In terms of evaluation, virtually all students wanted some input into their own grade, despite the fact that two out of three instructors did not give them that opportunity; and a majority wanted to control at least fifty percent of their own evaluation. However, this should not be interpreted to mean, necessarily, that students therefore felt that they had developed a capacity for mature self-judgement. It may just as well reflect a belief that such an input could be used to improve the grade which they were awarded for the course. Most students rejected the idea of an examination as part of the evaluation process, preferring for the most part, a combination of assignments and student presentations,[17] although there were differences between the sections here which I shall touch upon later.

Course work-loads were considered by most students as average or below average, although again there were differences between sections. Seventy-five percent of instructor one's respondents considered his work loads average and twenty-five percent less than average. Sixty percent of instructor two's respondents regarded his work load as average, twenty five percent less than average and fifteen percent more than average. Fifty percent of instructor three's respondents regarded his work load as average, thirty-five percent less than average and fifteen percent more than average.[18] This probably represents, in my view, the amount of definition and guidance each instructor gave with regard to the work each student should do in the course.

As one might expect from what I have said in previous chapters, there was very little understanding amongst the students of the professor's ideas - only two of the interviewed students were able to articulate in anything like a satisfactory manner, in my definitions, what they perceived the professor's objectives to be.[19] Yet, when I articulated my version of what the professor's objectives were, they nearly all regarded them as objectives they would like to pursue and as practical in terms of the course they were taking; although several of the students felt that there should be follow-up courses since one could only begin to investigate the dimensions of such an approach to education in a half semester course.[20]

I want to move on now to consider in more detail some of the responses of students in each section, using mainly the data obtained from the interviews I conducted.

Variations in Student Responses from Section to Section

The students I interviewed [21] from section one were reasonably consistent in their responses, which may well, in turn, reflect consistency on the part of the instructor. Thus five out of the eight thought that the main theme of the instructor was the development of a methodological base for the analysis of arguments and points of view, and seven of them considered that he had followed his objectives closely in his classroom practice. Similarly six out of the eight thought that his course had more thought provoking ideas in it than most they had taken. However, all members of the day class who were interviewed thought that the instructor had not made enough provision for student interaction (through small groups, not class discussion) and none of them thought that the student interaction in this section was greater than in most of their courses.

As one might expect the response of the three students in the evening class was very different. They all agreed that student interaction in this course was far greater than any other and felt that the combination of a small seminar group, the willingness of the instructor to encourage discussion, and the social activities which took place after the class, allowed enough student interaction during the course

There was general agreement that students had not learned many new facts, but that they had learned a considerable amount about how to use knowledge in the development of arguments. The one dissenter on this point was a member of the night class - an interesting point given the fact that the instructor regarded this group as containing the most able and responsive students. However the sample is so small that very little should be made of this in terms of the two classes within the section. Unlike the other two sections, there was no general agreement about the need for a longer time period amongst the five students taking the day class, which reflects, to some extent, the improved ability of this instructor to organise his class-time within that framework.[22]

I have touched already upon the improvements that students wanted in terms of pedagogy; but in terms of curriculum there was no general pattern of overall agreement. However, several students expressed a desire for a course which they termed would be "more concrete" and one of the day class, and all the evening class, wanted the course to follow more closely the initial outline handed out by the instructor. To understand this perhaps I should mention the part of this outline which is crucial in this regard:

> In short, our objectives are:
> 1. To understand more fully both who I am and how I came to be that way.
> 2. To do this I must be able to find some criteria for evaluating myself[23]

The point is that, even if the instructor felt that this is exactly what he was doing, by insisting that the students enter his social world before they could become learners, he greatly reduced the possibility that they would be able to develop criteria for evaluating themselves.

The students, then, were generally agreed about the consistency of the instructor's curriculum, but wanted more small group work and, perhaps, a curriculum which reflected more closely their perceived needs in terms of their current existential realities.

There was nothing like the same kind of consistency concerning a curriculum theme amongst the students I interviewed in section two as there was in section one. Thus one student thought the instructor's theme was "trying to give us a background to where the foundations began",[24] another thought it was about "trying to tie together the sciences. . . (and) learning about yourself",[25] and so on. The only consistency was in the suggestion by four people that the theme contained, amongst other things, the development by students of a self-awareness.

The inability of the students to identify a general curriculum theme is reflected in their general agreement that in the classroom situation the instructor was unable to implement a consistent curricular theme. In explaining this, they generally blamed it on the frequent use by the instructor, especially in the first month, of the restricted linguistic codes of various social science interests. They blamed it on the frequent pursuit of irrelevancies by instructor and students during discussions which purported to deal with a specific subject area. They blamed it on a failure to integrate the various themes dealt with, and on the unwillingness of students to reach any form of compromise in public debate.

This sense of antagonism amongst students was mentioned by the instructor and does seem to be supported to some extent by the fact that, while fifty percent and forty percent of students from sections one and two respectively were willing to consider other students' input into their evaluation, only twenty percent of instructor two's class were willing to do the same.[26] This does suggest a smaller amount of trust amongst students in instructor two's section. However, whether this was merely related to the personalities of the students in that section, or whether it developed as part of the sense of confusion and frustration felt by so many students during that first month,[27] it is very difficult to say.

While only five of the students in section two considered that the the course had been more thought provoking than most of their other courses, all the students felt that the main purpose of the course was concentrated round learning to use knowledge rather than learning new facts.

Nevertheless, only four of the eight students felt that it had been a beneficial experience in terms of learning how to use knowledge. The other four felt they had learnt relatively little during the course. However, only three students felt that the opportunities for interaction with other students were greater in this course than in other courses. This supports my suggestion that class discussion went via the instructor rather than in the form of student/student dialogue. Yet six students would have liked more student interaction in small groups, despite some of their views on the abrasive nature of student interaction at a class level.

In the improvements that the students suggested should be made, all the students wanted the instructor to use a simpler language form in his curriculum, and most of them wanted more direction and simplicity, during the first month. Most of the students thought that two one and a half hour periods would be more appropriate than three one hour periods, and considered that there should be much more small group work.

In short, in terms of curriculum, the students wanted more simplicity and more definition of subject matter, while in terms of pedagogy they wanted more small group interaction, longer class times and a stricter adherence to the topics under discussion.

Most of the students in section three were able to explicate the instructor's curricular theme,[28] at least so far as expressing it in terms of moving through the three thought levels articulated by the instructor; and most of them felt that there was a reasonable correlation between objectives and what happened in the classroom situation.

Six of the eight students considered that they had found the course more thought provoking than most they had taken, although only four of them felt that they had learned much about using knowledge. This despite the fact that they all considered this to be the main thrust of the course.

In terms of student interaction all the students considered there had been more opportunity for student interaction in this course than in most others they had taken, but, even so, six of the eight would have liked even more opportunity for small group work; thus supporting the finding that sixty five percent of the section which were surveyed in the questionnaire considered group work one of the pedagogical techniques most appropriate to this course.[29] It is, I think, significant that six of the eight should opt for more small group work, since this was the only section where small group work was used to any great extent.

Six of the eight students made reference to the fact that the instructor intervened too swiftly in class discussion, especially during the third unit of the course, and there was clearly some difference between the way in which the instructor perceived his role[30] and the students perceived it. However, at the same time, some students expressed a desire for more organisation in the earlier part of the course, and this was a frequent complaint I heard from students during the early part of the course.

In short, then, in terms of curriculum the students wanted more early direction and definition, but, perhaps, less direction and definition in the latter stages of the course, while, pedagogically, they wanted more student control, more small group interaction and longer time periods for each class.

In conclusion, before I move on to consider the students' roles and suggestions within the framework of educational knowledge codes, I should say that the data from which I have extrapolated my comments, is, in my view, only suitable to indicate trends, and sometimes not even that. I am well aware of the vagaries of using such a small interview sample and the unreliability of all questionnaire responses which stray beyond the simplest factual evidence. Like all the data used in previous chapters this data is in many respects hopelessly inadequate to capture the enormous complexities of any human situation. My only consolation is that almost all the sociological data I have seen is also pathetically inadequate for the assumptions and suggestions extrapolated from it. Hence I am, if not in good, at least in numerous company in terms of what I have done.

Student Responses and Educational Knowledge Codes

The students who attended the course which I investigated had, through their prior biographical experiences,[31] strong propensities towards philosophical positions applicable to Integrated or Collection Code knowledge codes.

Living in a province which tends towards particularism and is largely apolitical, as virtually all of them did, it is likely that the social world of these students, like the majority of the population in the province, will be based on unreflexive assumptions about that world which are ideologically bourgeois in nature. Certainly when one considers the high percentage of students who came from new bourgeois and farming backgrounds[32], it seems increasingly likely that they will have internalised bourgeois values and understandings.

However as children of a largely new bourgeoisie, founded on the wealth of the oil industry, which is a creation of the late 1950s and 1960s, these students are less likely, I would suggest, to be troubled by the complexities of trying to resolve the fundamental contradictions between humanitarianism and competition which trouble so many of their peers in other areas of the advanced industrial world. Their parents, like the new bourgeoisies of Europe and the United States in the middle and late nineteenth centuries, evince a philosophical position which strongly supports competitive individualism, with humanism carefully locked away in the immutable unproblematics of religion and the 'United Way'. Added to this these same students have been educated in a school system which evaluates success solely in terms of the ability of the individual to compete for grades, have, for the most part either close friends, family relatives or parents, who are active agents of such a system, and are currently in a university system where the grade point average perspective rules supreme.

Given all these conditions it would be surprising if the vast majority of the students had not internalised an ideology of competitive individualism, and so are likely to be in a position closer to a Collection Code than even an Integrated Code.

When one adds to this, the generally negative attitude which students expressed about the course prior even to its beginning, due to its generally bad reputation and student belief that it was compulsory, it would seem highly unlikely that there could be much sense of personal commitment on the part of the students, a necessary prerequisite for successful learning under Integrated and Emancipatory Codes, unless instructors could make an immediate impression on the students which counteracted at least their negative attitudes.

All instructors seem to have achieved some success in this regard, if the students I interviewed were a representative sample. However the organisational problem which instructors two and three experienced during the first month may well have caused some students to become disillusioned with what they were doing. It is when this happens that prior negative attitudes can play an important part in persuading the student not to persevere, and merely go "through the motions" of working and understanding what is happening for the rest of the course.

While I think this happened to some extent in instructor two and three's sections in the first month it was, I felt , particularly noticeable with instructor three's section when he moved towards a Collection Code situation in his unit three. I shall say more of this later.

It would appear, from the responses of the students interviewed, that students from all three courses recognised significant differences between this course and other courses they were taking in terms of curriculum, and that these differences represent, in current teaching practices, one of the major differences between Collection and Integrated Code forms. Thus students unanimously viewed the course as being concerned with the use of knowledge and the development of cross-disciplinary methodologies of analysis and understanding.[33]

In terms of pedagogy, it appears that the students may well have been more perceptive than the instructors, since they were able to recognise a changed role for the student that involved a more active participation on the part of the student. This they perceived in terms of the need for more small group interaction amongst students. It seems that the students were aware that:

> Central to this epistemology (of Integrated Codes) therefore, is a view of human learning, and human sociation generally, as being derived from a dialectical relationship between consciousness and socially-approved, socially-distributed knowledge.[34]

It may well reflect a realisation on the part of the students that the use of critical reasoning processes, even within the world of teacher defined educational realities, is often best achieved by independent, student, small group discussion, as long as this discussion has clearly defined aims.[35]

The request by nearly all students, interviewed or responding to the questionnaire, that classes should be smaller may well reflect, in part, a general dislike for the anonymity of large group gatherings. But it may also reflect a particular realisation, that to achieve success under Integrated Code forms, there is a need to establish a personal relationship with the instructor unnecessary under Collection Code forms. Certainly several of the students interviewed expressed the opinion that they considered large classes singularly inappropriate for this type of course.

Again, in terms of an examination, several students questioned its appropriateness, arguing that they had not learned the gobbets of facts on which they could be examined. Clearly, here, the fact that most of their courses , were of a Collection Code form where the examination served mainly as a test of the ability to regurgitate facts, in the minds of the students at least, made them regard an examination in a course where the emphasis had been on learning to use knowledge, as inappropriate The problem for the students was, I think, related to the incompatibility of the two types of course and the previous forms of evaluation used in this course, as opposed to most courses they had taken. It is interesting, in this regard, that instructor three also regarded an examination as inappropriate,[35] although he gave one, for this type of course.

However, as I have remarked,[36] I do not regard examinations as necessarily inappropriate under Integrated Code forms, as long as they give precedence in importance of evaluation to forms of continuous assessment.

I want now to consider briefly each section of the course separately.

Instructor one was clearly the most successful in persuading students to enter his defined priorities of educational realities in terms of curriculum, according to the students interviewed. But in the day class several students regarded the pedagogical techniques he used as not very suitable for the achievement of his curricular purposes. However, by dividing his section into two classes, the instructor may have been able to establish a more personal relationship with both day and evening classes than did other instructors with their larger groups. This may well have led to a greater sense of personal commitment on the part of his students, and so a greater willingness to enter his (the instructor's) defined framework of the learner's world.

But I should add that the greater consistency of this instructor in the pursuit of, and the greater simplicity of, his curricular objectives, made it much easier for his students to come to terms, at least partially, with their instructor's defined realities.

This helps to explain, I think, the apparent paradox that all the students interviewed from the day class were critical of the instructor's pedagogy; and yet they all considered that they had, at the same time, learned something about how to use knowledge and develop arguments, which was one of the main objectives of the course.

Instructors two and three were clearly not so successful in achieving their curricular objectives.

Students in section two pointed out the importance of consistency of curricular objectives and linguistic comprehensibility on the part of the instructor, if they were to enter his defined world of learning. This is important under any code form; but when, under Integrated Codes, there are not the authoritative sources available under Collection Codes, which a student may consult, it becomes doubly important that the teacher be consistent and understandable. Again students pointed out the desirability of more small group interaction as a suitable pedagogy for such a course, in accord with the type of pedagogy suitable for Integrated Codes. However it should be remembered that some sixty percent of the questionnaire respondents for this course regarded lecturing as also a viable pedagogy for the course, the largest percentage from any section. It may well be that they were explicating what students in other sections treated as assumed, i.e. the instructor would define the framework of relevance within which any small group interaction would take place.

The students in section three wanted more direction and specification of curricular objectives in the early part of the course, where they perceived not so much a lack of consistency as a lack of direction and purpose. Students were neither clear about their roles nor that of the instructor. However there was general agreement that the group work in unit two allowed many students to begin to clarify understandings and develop, at least partially, a sense of direction. An interesting point here is that, although the initial selection of topics was made by students, several students regarded them as not related to their own interests. While this clearly reflects the diversity of interest amongst students in the section it may well reflect, in the first unit at least, a belief that the instructor was, in discussion, manipulating these topics to fit within his own understandings of their frames of reference rather than the students', in classic Integrated Code fashion. Another possibility, of course, is that there was a general feeling that the pedagogy was not suitable to the curriculum in the first unit, since in such a large class students found it impossible to establish any form of personal relationship with the instructor.

During the second unit of the course, most of the students interviewed regarded the pedagogy as suitable in terms of the curriculum and several of them at least found the second unit a rewarding learning experience. In the third unit, however, considerable confusion again developed. Some of the students regarded the curriculum as irrelevant and/or very difficult to understand and most of them considered the instructor intervened during discussion far too quickly. Most of the students, then, did not interpret the instructor's warning at the end of the second unit correctly in terms of curriculum or pedagogy, i.e. in unit three I am the expert interpreter of knowledge and so must exercise much more explicit control over the pedagogical situation.[37] Therefore, like the instructor, did not perceive the essential changes in the nature of the curriculum which moved it towards a Collection Code framework, and so needed, to achieve success, consequent adjustments in the pedagogical relationships.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have briefly looked at the biographical background of the students enrolled in the three sections of the course which I investigated, and considered their perceptions of the course of which they were the recipients.

It would appear, from the student responses I obtained, that they were very much aware of the fact that the curriculum for this course was very different from that for most of their courses, and perceived the need for pedagogical changes to bring curriculum and pedagogy into accord. Since the students interviewed perceived the curriculum in Integrated Code form and considered that they should take a more active participatory role in the pedagogical process, it would appear that they were more perceptive than the instructors concerning the need to produce a synthesis of curriculum knowledge and pedagogical process under Integrated Code forms.

However I have deliberately avoided, so far, the question of how far I believe that these students were ready or willing to move into an Emancipatory Code form of educational situation. This is an enormously difficult question to even consider, let alone answer. One of the problems is that, without exposing the students to an Emancipatory Code situation, it is impossible to know how far they will be willing to accept the praxiological or reflexive dimensions of such a situation. However there is certain circumstantial evidence which does not make me sanguine about such a possibility.

The students live in a province which is conservative in its politics and ideology, and come from social groups which support and are a part of the ruling elite. Added to this they come in the main part from a new bourgeoisie for whom achievement and success in materialistic terms are not assumed as part of being a member of such a social group, but are still made explicit and fiercely defended.[38] Thus an individual who challenges such a position is likely to be regarded as a traitor rather than an eccentric, as is often the case with longer established bourgeois groups.

A typical example of the paranoia which can sweep the new bourgeoisie, when they feel their values may be threatened, is the vociferous opposition of the Edmonton Chamber of Commerce to the Alberta Department of Education's quite innocuous new Social Studies Curriculum.[39] Similarly these students come from homes where, for the most part, neither parent has any university experience, and so are first generation university students.

Such students are likely, I suggest, to have a high achievement motivation in terms of obtaining a university degree and are unlikely to even want to be critical of a system of which they are a part. The general satisfaction with university life amongst these students seems to suggest this.[40]

Again, the widespread contact with teachers, that was reported in the questionnaire responses, amongst these students, combined with the fact that they wish to become teachers at all, suggests that many of them probably regard the school system which they know with some favour. To challenge the basis of this system, which one would undoubtedly do under an Emancipatory Code, would mean that the students would not only have to reject their own assumptions and understandings about education, but would also have to do the same with the assumptions and understandings of their friends and mentors who are already enforcers of this system. Lastly we should bear in mind the finding of McLeish that the group of students, of which these were a part, are the most conservative in their political allegiances and the most religious of all university students.[41]

When all these factors are taken into account I think we can begin to see the enormity of the task facing anyone who wishes to introduce such students to a new concept of education through an Emancipatory Code situation in a mere thirteen weeks.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Appendix I.

[2] Appendix I.

[3] These interviews were carried out and tape-recorded during the last two weeks of the course: March 24th to April 4th 1975.

[4] c/f Appendix I.

[5] John McLeish, Students' Attitudes and College Environments Cambridge Institute of Education 1970.

[6] Theodore W.Adorno et al The Authoritarian Personality Harper 1950

[7] i.e. the biographical questionnaire, see above footnote [2].

[8] See above, footnote [3].

[9] This is a good example of how actors, in this case, student advisers, can impose their own constraints upon the situation.

[10] See above, footnote [3].

[11] Appendix I.

[12] Ibid.

[13] See above, footnote [3].

[14] Ibid.

[15] This is supported by Beard in Ruth Beard, Teaching and Learning in Higher Education Penguin 1970, Chapter V.

[16] To get student support for the evening class the instructor explained the advantages of attendance at such a class at the beginning of the course.

[17] As indicated in the evaluation questionnaire in Appendix I.

[18] Ibid.

[19] c/f footnote [3].

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] I touched upon this in the previous chapter.

[23] Course outline given out by instructor one at the beginning of the course.

[24] See above, footnote [3].

[25] Ibid.

[26] As indicated in the evaluation questionnaire in Appendix I.

[27] Expressed in the interviews and by students with whom I talked during the first month.

[28] See above, footnote [3].

[29] See above, footnote [3], and Appendix I.

[30] The instructor remarked during an interview April 10th 1975, "At all times I recognised that much more should come from them and that my role was marginal".

[31] Through the biographical questionnaire - Appendix I.

[32] Some seventy two percent of the respondents in the biographical questionnaire.

[33] As revealed during interviews with the sample.

[34] Geoffrey M.Esland, "Teaching and Learning as the Organization of Knowledge" in Knowledge and Control ed. by M.F.D.Young, Collier-MacMillan 1971 p. 94.

[35] As explicated during interview April 10th 1975.

[36] In Chapter III.

[37] Stated in class March 5th 1975.

[38] This, I would suggest, is one of the most notable differences between a well established bourgeoisie in a country such as Britain, and a new bourgeoisie in an area such as Alberta.

[39] My thanks to Mr. D.Ledgerwood, Alberta Provincial Department of Education who brought this to my attention.

[40] As explicated during my interviews with the students.

[41] McLeish, op. cit.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The Problem

The problem in this dissertation was twofold in nature, involving both the development of a theoretical perspective and the examination of an empirical situation in the light of that theoretical perspective.

In the development of the theoretical perspective I utilised Dawe's suggestion[1] that there are two sociologies founded on very different assumptions and understandings about the nature of man: one where man is seen as the wilful self-destructive creature of Hobbes,[2] needing the constraints of society and social institutions to prevent him from destroying himself; the other seeing man as potentially creative, controlling and reflexive, but constrained by reified institutional and societal structures and ideologies, in the hidden interests of a dominant ruling elite. In the former the problem for the sociologist is to ensure the continued subservience of men to the needs of society; in the latter the problem is to help the subservient majority regain control of society's institutions and create a society where all men can exercise their true potential.

In the light of these suggestions I examined

Bernstein's theoretical formulation of two forms of educational reality,[3] one descriptive and one predictive, and put forward the thesis that Bernstein's two formulations can both be seen as clearly in Dawe's first category of sociological understanding. While I was willing to accept Bernstein's theoretical formulation of current normative educational realities I considered that predictively there was another alternative based upon Dawe's second category of sociological understanding. This alternative form I called the Emancipatory Educational Knowledge Code. This form, unlike Bernstein's predictive Integrated Educational Knowledge Code, is not the response of the educational system to the changing technological needs of society, but is the exercise of human will and understanding in the creation of new educational realities.

Using this theoretical framework I proceeded to examine an empirical situation in a large Western Canadian university organised on the basis of the typical North American course based Collection Code format, where a professor, acting as a curriculum developer, hoped, in a half semester education course, to develop an Emancipatory Code perspective.

Out of this empirical investigation there developed various implications for the implementation of an Emancipatory Code within current educational realities, which I shall consider in the next section.

Implications of the Study for the Implementation of an Emancipatory Code in a North American University Situation

In the empirical situation, which I have investigated, I suggested that the professor took the role of a curriculum developer and, as such, was responsible for demonstrating praxiologically the means by which the instructors should teach the course; and also the means by which they might reflexively examine both their own social world and that of the learners'. His role, then, was essentially to initiate the teachers into new understandings about the social world of which they were a part and into new understandings about the whole nature of teaching. This the professor patently failed to do. But that failure cannot be seen as his failure alone, because the development of such understandings in the instructors must be achieved by a dialectical process between instructors and professor. This brings me to the next point.

For teachers to move pedagogically within the framework of an Emancipatory Code there must develop certain understandings about the very nature of education which none of the instructors, apparently, were willing to evince.

I have termed the philosophical positions of instructors one and three as positivistic in terms of their views on the objectives of education.* This in not intended to be slighting and represents the majority position amongst educationists and sociologists generally.

Instructor Two's position was rather different, being between phenomenology and existentialism.[5] However that position also takes as given the structural framework of society and ignores the hidden ideological interests and inequalities within society in its belief in the emancipatory qualities of a "scientistic" value -free rationalism, combined with a freely acting asocial man.

Although the positions of instructors one and three, and instructor two, are somewhat different theoretically, they do represent, all of them, a fundamentally conservative position, which explicitly, or implicitly in the terms of phenomenology, sees man as operating within and responding to the needs of currently existing societal structures. But this position is intrinsically antithetical to the model of man operative under an Emancipatory Code, where man is seen as the maker of social change and the reformulator of societal structures. This is not to suggest that, since the instructors held this view at the time at which they were interviewed by me,[6] that it was impossible for teaching within an Emancipatory Code to take place. But it did mean that the professor, as curriculum developer, had to, between the time of those interviews and the beginning of the course, radically alter the instructors' views on the objectives of education, and this he failed to do.

In my opinion, given the relatively short time normally available for meetings prior to the teaching of a course in the university,[7] it is important that the professor have instructors under his charge who are sympathetic at least with the principles underlying the Emancipatory Code. In this regard, I should point out that the professor did initially select instructors one and two because he did perceive them to be sympathetic to these principles, and only discovered subsequently that, while they were sympathetic to the integration of knowledge and, to at least some extent, the breaking-down of the barriers between educational and everyday knowledge; they perceived these within the understandings of an Integrated rather than Emancipatory Code.

Therefore, I do not think; even if the professor had not himself attempted to lay down a structure for the course, even if he had not prescribed a textbook, even if he had enforced a credit/fail system of evaluation, even if he had concentrated on translating the principles he had enunciated into a commonly agreed praxiology of curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation; he would have gained the sense of intense personal commitment from the instructors necessary for success, without fundamentally altering their personal philosophical positions regarding education. This is why, I would argue, that a knowledge of or empathy with at least one of the authors who are currently referred to as critical theorists, is probably very helpful[8] for instructors prior to preparation for a course of this kind.

We cannot ignore, either, the previous biographical experiences of the instructors.

As I have indicated,[9] I consider the previous biographical experience of the professor as an important factor in his formulation of the course, and consider that the previous biographical experiences of the instructors were likewise important factors in shaping what they did in the teaching of the course.

However, perhaps, I should point out that the narrowness of the biographical experience of instructors one and two, who were born, bred and educated in Alberta, may well have made it very difficult for them to critically examine the "deep structures" of a society of which they were so completely members, or to see this society within broader perspectives. In this respect, it is worth remembering Gouldner's finding concerning the large percentage of structural functionalist sociologists who were brought up in "small town conservative America",[10] Mannheim's view that only a "displaced person" has the breadth of experience to develop the necessary understandings to practice sociology,[11] Stonequist's[12] stress on the importance of living with conflicting perspectives in the development of a greater breadth of vision, and the general lack of any tradition of radical political criticism in Alberta. All of these point to the great problems which instructors one and two would have experienced in attempting to move into the professor's educational perspective.

Instructor three had a breadth of biographical experience which might well have allowed him to enter the professor's educational perspective, but his biographical experience had committed him firmly to a Collection Code framework. For him to have entered the professor's educational perspective would have necessitated the rejection of all he had achieved so far and the jeopardising of his future career prospects.

In short there were good reasons within the biographical experience, I suggest, of all three instructors, to indicate why they rejected the perspective which the professor put forward as the guiding principle for the course.

Since there was a rejection, on the part of the instructors, of the fundamentals of an Emancipatory Code situation prior to the beginning of the course, there is clearly little point in discussing how far the pedagogical situations in the three sections of the course fulfilled the demands of an Emancipatory Code.

I have also already indicated the problems which I perceive the students must overcome before they are able to move into the framework of an Emancipatory Code. However, I should add to this that the whole question of whether an

Emancipatory Code and Collection Code can co-exist within one institutional organisation is, in my opinion, highly problematic.

Clearly, if one course pursues an Emancipatory Code perspective and is successful in persuading students to adopt this perspective, then it is highly unlikely that these students will, for the rest of their univers,ity careers "bracket" this perspective and bring it out for use at a future date. To do so would be to deny the very "emancipatory" process carried out under an Emancipatory Code and to prostitute their new found capacity for human praxis. They would have to accept the sub-human role of a passive receiver of largely irrelevant educational knowledge from expert knowledge givers, if they wished to continue their studies within the institutional framework of Collection Codes. If they have achieved emancipation they will reject this role and enter into debate with both their peers and their professors concerning curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Not to do so would be to deny the praxiological element of the Emancipatory Code. How their peers or professors will react to this is a matter of conjecture.

What does seem clear is that such students will produce a considerable amount of turmoil inside the university and, if successful, will radically alter the nature of university education and its role in society. In this sense we may see the results of this, if successful, in terms akin to a move from a view of university reform where:

> Increasing productivity is the sole basis of a reform that smoothly integrates the depoliticized university into the system of social labor and at the same time inconspicuously cuts its ties to the political, public realm. . . (to a view where) . . .the universtiy asserts itself within the democratic system. . . (and) . . . we subject to critical discussion both attitudes of political consequence and motives that form the university as a scientific institution and a social organization.[13]

I would regard this as the movement of the university towards its "true" role in society, but there are those who would disagree, in practice if not in theory, with this position.

It might be argued that the course based Collection Code of a North American university is, nevertheless, a good place for a teacher to attempt the introduction of an Emancipatory Code, given the strong "classification" and "framing" between the courses and the semi-autonomous position of the instructor to do as he will. But the implicit assumption behind this freedom given to instructors, in a course-based Collection Code, is that what each teacher does in his course will not interfere with the freedom of instructors in other courses, and will bear some relation to the supposed subject area of the discipline. If the instructor's activities in one course lead to student activities which spill over into other courses, then the instructor has violated the first of these implicit assumptions and as such, I suggest, will come under pressure to conform or to go elsewhere.

In support of this suggestion it is worth reporting that a senior professor in the Sociology Department in this same university has recently come under severe pressure, including a university senate inquiry, for daring to ignore the mythical "bell curve" of average mediocrity in awarding grades for an undergraduate level course he was teaching.

While it might be argued that the conflict, where this professor was concerned, stemmed from fundamental ideological differences between members of that department; I find it an ominous portent of what might happen to instructors in the event of the successful implementation of an Emancipatory Code, especially where those instructors are graduate students.

It is not, I think, mere coincidence that Freire worked with illiterate peasants in an obscure village in North Eastern Brazil.[14] Firstly, with such people there was no apparatus of successful achievement under the current educational or social system to be dismantled, in other words the peasants did not have to reject their own self-image as an "achiever" under the current system. Secondly, and more relevantly in the light of what I have been referring to, the peasants were largely regarded as societal rejects, a "lumpenproletariat" which could be ignored by the ruling classes as long as they did not cause any "trouble", i.e. as long as they did not enter their world of consciousness. Even so Freire had, eventually, to flee the country.

I would not want to equate the political, economic and social situations of Canada with those of Brazil and I consider that Canada can be regarded as an advanced industrial capitalist state, for my purposes at least.

However, this is not to say that all areas of Canada can be so considered, and we should bear in mind here Althusser's suggestion that, within the ideological apparatus of the state, there may exist "regional idelogies" differing in emphasis to that of the state as a whole.[15] These ideologies may be defined within the spectrum of liberal bourgeois ideologies of pluralism, given the continuing exercise of power by the ruling elite, and conservative bourgeois ideologies of conformity and consensus.[16] The importance of this for those living under these ideologies, for what I am considering, is that, under the former type, ambiguities and understandings opposed to those of the ruling elite are much more likely to be tolerated than under the latter ideology. Having said this I would argue that the "regional ideology" governing the social relationships in the province where this university is situated is clearly, in my opinion, conservative in nature. The fact that this province has never had in its legislature an effective political opposition party to the party in power is perhaps the most dramatic example of the conforming nature of its conservative ideology.

Given this, and the increasing control over university government exercised directly by the political elite, unwilling to accord the university the academic freedom considered normal in Britain, as well as the control exercised indirectly through financial support; the difficulty of implementing an Emancipatory Code is greatly increased. Thus what Althusser calls the "repressive State apparatus"[17] is likely to be used much earlier than under a liberal bourgeois ideology to try and enforce conformity to the dominant ideological position.

In this section I have, perhaps, been unduly pessimistic about the problems facing anyone wishing to introduce an Emancipatory Code in the empirical situation which I have investigated. However I consider it important that the problems, which I perceive in the implementation of such a code, be clearly enunciated. I am not denying the possibility or desirability of introducing an Emancipatory Code in this situation, but I am trying to point out the painful realities involved in such action, especially if it is successful.

In this section I have tried to point briefly to the problems for any curriculum developer in the implementation of an Emancipatory Code in the type of empirical situation which this study has investigated, and to the problems which must be faced if the curriculum developer is successful in implementing such a code.

However, since I have argued that no instructor even attempted to implement an Emancipatory Code and have suggested that they can, for the most part, be perceived as pursuing objectives within the framework of an Integrated Code; I think it necessary to consider what implications there are for the implementation of an Integrated Code in an institution where Collection Code forms are dominant.

Implications of the Study for the Implementation of an Integrated Code

I have suggested, in this study, that instructors one and two pursued a form of curriculum, consistently throughout their courses, which could be described as Integrated Code in form; and the students perceived that instructor three likewise was pursuing a form of Integrated Code curriculum, although I have remarked that I considered this instructor moved towards a Collection Code format during the last three weeks of the course.[18]

In pursuing this form of curriculum none of the instructors met with undue resistance from the students. However, I think this can be explained by the particular relationship between the type of Collection Code operative at this university and the nature of the curriculum under Integrated Codes.

Bernstein has remarked:

> The course-based non-specialized U.S.A. form of the collection, I suggest, has the weakest classification _and_ framing of the collection code, especially at the secondary and university level.[19]

But I would suggest that classification and framing in this university, and I suspect at most North American universities, tends to be overtly at the level of the course[20] rather than the discipline, as in European forms of the Collection Code, particularly in junior level courses. Thus students tend to take particular courses rather than courses within a particular discipline. Because of this students must develop their understandings within the framework of each course, and so rely very much on teacher definitions of educational reality which they may well not perceive within the larger framework of the discipline at all. When one adds to this the similar perception of instructors, of each course as a semi-autonomous unit; and their positions, at least in Education and the Social Sciences, as "high priests" or "novice high priests" of conflicting paradigms within their discipline, who will view reality in terms of their discipline; it is clear that students are very wise to work with teacher definitions and pay relatively little attention to the discipline within which those definitions are founded.

The evaluation system, which is a simple mean of the grades students receive in all course, rather than, for instance, a mean of say the best eighty percent of all the students' grades, merely reinforces the logic, for the student, of classifying and framing his educational realities solely in terms of courses and grades received for each course.

In this situation students may well perceive an Integrated Code form of curriculum as cross-disciplinary, as being abcut knowledge as process rather than knowledge as imbibed information; but will merely consider it as another form of teacher-defined, course-based Collection Code. In other words continue to treat an Integrated Code course in this situation as a course where they, the students, are expected to respond tc merely another set of teacher defined realities, and which the students will treat as a separate entity.

The pedagogy under Integrated Codes, where the learner is perceived as an active being working within the teacher definiticns of educational reality, might well produce some problems, because it is at odds with Collection Code pedagogy, where the learner is perceived as a passive recipient of knowledge.

However I would suggest that, in a university situation, such as the one I investigated, the use of such a pedagogy would be regarded as suitable for that particular course pursuing an Integrated Code, rather than something which students must demand in all courses.

In short, I am suggesting that the students would continue to defer to the primary aspect of their educational reality under a course-based Collection Code or an Integrated Code: that is the teacher's definition of educational reality. However, perhaps I should add here, that it would appear, from the requests of most of the students interviewed in the three sections,[21] that students do expect, under Integrated Codes, that their learning role should be more active than in fact it was. But this request can be interpreted as a recognition on the part of the learners of the inter-relation between certain forms of pedagogy, founded on the notion of the learner as an active being, and the curriculum under Integrated Codes. If this is so then it supports the links which both Bernstein[22], Esland[23] and I have made between Integrated Code forms of curriculum and pedagogy based on the notion of the learner as an active being.

Similarly we can see, from the questions which students raised about the comprehensibility of instructor two and about the consistency of instructor three[24], that these are very important factors in the ability of the student to enter the teacher's world of understanding, wherever the teacher is the prime definer of educational realities and is not acting as an agent for a superior agency. In this sense most university teachers can be seen under Collection Codes as definers of reality rather than agents of a superior agency.

It does seem, I would suggest, that there is a growing together at a university level, especially where learning is course rather than discipline based, of the roles of instructors as definers of educational realities under Collection and Integrated Codes; although those roles are based, at least in the situation which I investigated, on rather different definitions of what is valid knowledge.

In summary then it would appear, from this investigation, that most students perceived the three sections as being different in kind to the other courses they were taking, being concerned with knowledge as process and understanding, rather than knowledge as imbibed facts. They did not apparently find this, as such, any problem in terms of integration into the whole of their university education. I have suggested that this was due to the course based nature of the Collection Code within which they were working and the fact that it was a university situation.

Thus the paramount fact in their perceptions of educational reality is the strong classification between courses and the importance of the teacher as the definer of realities within each course. As such it is quite possible for an Integrated Code form to be utilised in one of these courses, without disturbing the equanimity of other course instructors. Only if several courses began to utilise conflicting integrating ideas under an Integrated Code would it become necessary for instructors to seek some form of consensus with regard to this integrating idea. When only one course does it the students may indeed come to regard it as the particular teacher defined function of that course, and so in a sense, legitimise its difference.

However there is a need for consistency of purpose and comprehensibility linguistically for teaching to be successful under integrated Codes, and this calls for careful planning, personal commitment, and some knowledge of the previous experience of the students. One of the complaints frequently made about instructor two, for instance, was that he anticipated a knowledge of particular theories which the students clearly did not have.[25]

Personal commitment is important because it produces a consistency of overall purpose which otherwise might, as in the case of instructor three, lead to the introduction of incompatible curriculum and pedagogy actually during the course, and to confusion on the part of students who are mystified by sudden changes in the nature of the curriculum and in the role of the instructor in the pedagogical process.

Wider Implications of the Study

In a study which has empirically examined such a small part of a specialised institutionalised educational reality it is very difficult to draw conclusions which might have any validity in a wider social situation. Thus anything which I say must be considered, even more than previously, as highly tentative suggestions.

From this study it does seem that under Integrated Codes there is a need for curriculum and pedagogy to be integrated round the concept of an active but conforming learner, in a manner not necessary under Collection Codes.

In saying this I am suggesting that curriculum under Integrated Codes places certain restrictions on what can be viewed as valid pedagogy in a way that Collection Code curriculum does not. Thus one can have the apparent anomaly of "a collection curriculum but an integrated pedagogy"[26] or one may even have a situation where learners are their own teachers, almost in the style of an Emancipatory Code.

The dichotomy between curriculum and pedagogy under Collection Codes results from the ultimate priority of knowledge as defined by the ontological realities of a discipline, rather than by a teacher. In this sense course-based Collection Codes of a North American type are a weaker form of Collection Code, since the teacher, or school board, exercise greater influence over what interpretations are to be accepted as valid, regardless of the ontological realities of the discipline, due to the organisational nature of the courses in terms of the learners. This allows them to be largely disciplinarily indiscriminate in their choice of courses, particularly at a university undergraduate level. Thus there is nothing similar to the intensive socialisation into the ontological realities of disciplined knowledge which occurs, particularly in the higher reaches of education in Britain, and to a lesser extent in Europe as a whole.

With respect to the relative positions of power in the pedagogical relationship it does appear that teachers under an Integrated Code may perceive that, if they utilise the pedagogy of an Integrated Code, their power in the pedagogical relationship will be seriously compromised. This fear was certainly expressed by instructor one and, to some extent, by instructor two; although I have argued that, in my view, the power of the teacher in the pedagogical relationship is increased under Integrated Codes, because of the greater control they exercise over what will be defined as valid educational reality. However, teachers become definers of the parameters of valid educational reality and providers of knowledge resources and conceptual frameworks within such parameters, rather than providers of knowledge content, as such. This requires the exercise of a social control which is manipulative rather than repressive, within, of course, the implicit understandings of the ultimate subservience of the learner.

It is the change in the nature of the power of the teacher in the pedagogical relationship which may well be misunderstood as a loss in power, rather than a change in its nature, by practising teachers. It does seem possible that teachers may need to be socialised into the changed nature of power in the pedagogical relationship at an early age, perhaps even during their initial teacher training. The fact that this began to happen widely in the teacher training of British Primary School teachers from the early 1960s onwards, combined with the relatively short teaching life of Primary School teachers, who were mainly female, at that time, may account in part for the successful introduction of Integrated Codes in such institutions, i.e. Primary Schools.

I have already talked at some length about the importance of a sense of personal commitment to the learning process on the part of the teacher and learners under Integrated and Emancipated Codes, as one of the ingredients for pedagogical success, and have pointed to the need for a commonly understood linguistic means of communication, and a set of problems which the learners are, technically, and consider themselves to be, capable of solving, given their prior educational experience. In this situation the real difference between Integrated and Emancipatory Codes stems from the reflexivity which the teacher, initially, and then the learner, develop about their individual and social worlds. Only when teachers and learners are willing to break through the ideological constraints which distort their perceptions of reality will they be able to move into a state of consciousness which can respond to the principles of an Emancipatory Code.

In developing this willingness to break through the ideological restraints distorting their perceptions of reality I think it is important to refer back to what Marx and Engels had to say about alienation in The Holy Family, when they wrote:

> The possessing and the proletarian class represent one and the same human self-alienation. But the former feels satisfied and affirmed in this self-alienation experiences the alienation as a sign of its own power and possesses in it the appearance of a human existence. The latter, however, feels destroyed in this alienation, seeing in it its own impotence and the reality of an inhuman existence.[27]

I have argued that teachers, and intending teachers, are, for the most part, members of the possessing class through their familial background; therefore I would regard them as singularly unresponsive to the principles of an Emancipatory Code.

Only, I would suggest, where you have a capitalist society in a clear state of crisis is one likely to find members of the possessing class responsive to the principles of an Emancipatory Code which will liberate both proletariat and bourgeoisie and use the largely untapped human potential of both to create a new social order where all men may exercise their essentially human capacity for individual diversity and social cooperation.

In my opinion the praxiology of an Emancipatory Code is much more likely to succeed in countries such as Britain or Italy, or Canadian provinces such as Quebec, than it is in a Canadian province experiencing the short-term materialistic wealth of an unreflexively scientistic capitalism.

The Influence of the Author's Biographical Experience on his Philosophical Position : A Reflexive Glance

I was born into a family which had, on my father's side, been members of the bourgeoisie for at least three generations. My father was an accountant by training, and was upwardly mobile for most of his life, moving from the position of a middle executive, to the position of managing director, or president, of a medium sized English subsidiary of a large American Corporation.

I was educated mainly at preparatory school and a minor "public school" as a day boy until I was just seventeen years old. At that time, having just taken 'O' level G.C.E. I found the thought of another two years of schooling intolerable, and so decided to leave.

I was very hazy about what I might want to do; but since teaching would have required another two years at school and my father had referred to it scathingly as "not a profession", I decided to opt for either accountancy or law, in either case of which I would be able to take "articles". I chose accountancy, I suspect mainly because my father was an accountant and he was able to use his influence to get me articled with a large and rapidly expanding firm of Chartered Accountants in the City of London.

During the next almost three years I worked for this firm travelling all over England as an auditor and seeing at first hand, through audits and business efficiency studies, how capitalism worked.

I became increasingly disenchanted, however, with the work I was doing and the whole business ethos which was clearly placing profit before the welfare of employees; so that I eventually left to train as a teacher in a College of Education in the North East of England.

This brought me my first contact with the warmth and friendliness of working class people and the problems of bourgeois cultural imperialism as an ideology of education, not that I, at the time, recognised it as such. This problem came back to haunt me from time to time for the next six years as I found that I, and student teachers I observed, were able to make meaningful contact with working class children at only a very superficial level. This happened both under the Collection Codes of the Secondary

School and the Integrated Codes of the Primary School situations, in which I both taught and supervised student teachers. While contact was made at a human level, and quite often warm relationships were established, there seemed little educationally which they could learn. This was particularly apparent under the Integrated Code of the Primary School where bourgeois children were able at times to demonstrate what appeared surprising insights and maturity in their thoughts and work. But the uneasiness over the working class children and what they made of school situations remained.

During four years of my school teaching experience I studied in the evening for a first degree in History at Birkbeck College, London University.

I was very fortunate to come into contact there, not only with some very bright students, but also with some of the most able English Historians about. Amongst these perhaps the most important influence in terms of this thesis was E.J.Hobsbawm who introduced me both to Marx and a Marxist interpretation of history. Not the determinist Marx of the Stalinists and to some extent, Althusser, but the humanist Marx of the critical theorists, who saw men as both creators of and created by human circumstances through a dialectical process.

Some three years ago a growing dissatisfaction with my role as a History lecturer in a College of Education, where

I was gaining more pleasure from my subsidiary roles as student teacher supervisor and professional training instructor than my main role as lecturer in History; combined with a growing realisation of the possibilities in the sociology of education, as explicated by colleagues teaching the subject and in such books as Knowledge and Control,[28] as a means of explaining the clash between working class consciousness and bourgeois education; led me to apply to enter an M.Ed. programme specialising in sociology of education in various English universities and in Canada, under a Commonwealth Scholarship scheme.

Why I chose Canada would be difficult to say, except that my brother was in Canada and enjoying it and I had several friends and acquaintenances who had been to Canada and also enjoyed it.

Having been placed on the reserve list for a Commonwealth Scholarship and heard nothing more about it, and having accepted one of the places offered me at an English University; it came as something of a surprise to be offered a place at the University of Alberta on July 12th 1973, which, after some heart-searching I decided to accept.

Studying at the University of Alberta has been, for me, a radicalising experience; in part a reaction against the monolithic political conservative ideology of the province, in part because I found the "aseptic sociology" dominant in the university theoretically distasteful and methodologically unsound; in part because I found myself attracted to people at the university who were more radical in their tendencies; and in part, perhaps, because as a "marginal man" I found it easier to be reflexive about my own biographical experiences.

This radicalisation process has really gained momentum in the last year with exposure to the ideas of Schutz, the Goldsmith School of Phenomenology, Cicourel, J.D. Douglas and the American Phenomenologists, Lukacs, Gramsci, Althusser and Habermas, Freire, A.K. Davis, Garfinkle, Stehr, Rex and I.Taylor. During this process I have criticised positivistic sociology from a phenomenological position, criticised phenomenology from a Marxist perspective, and struggled with the continuing dilemmas, for me, of praxis and revolution as the methodological tools of a Marxist philosophy.

This produced radically different understandings about the nature of Bernstein's work, and of sociology generally, and moved me into a position close to that of the critical theorists of the Frankfurt and English schools.

In this biographical process we can see, I think, a rejection of the profit motive as the driving force of productive relations, which clarified the contradictions in the "high culture" of English bourgeios life between humanism and capitalism. This led me, in a sense, to try and step outside the profit element of capitalism by entering teaching; and thus realising, for the first time, that there existed a very different form of culture amongst working class people. Over the next few years there developed a growing realisation that working class children learned little within the currently existing educational realities, whether they be Collection or Integrated Codes. It is, however, only in the last year that I have come to some understanding of why an educational system founded on a bourgeois ideology can only half educated bourgeois children and cannot educate at all working class children.

In this thesis, drawing mainly upon Freire, Garfinkle and Habermas, I began to develop a very crude, and at times confused, alternative educational framework which would allow all members of society to develop their full human capacities and so change the very nature of the society of which they are a part.

Comments on the Assumptions and Methodology used in the Thesis

As I have indicated in the previous section, when I began the research for this thesis in November 1974 I had not fully developed a philosophical position in contradistinction to Bernstein's; and so I had not clearly delineated for myself the differences between the Integrated and Emancipatory Codes. As a result, during the time I was carrying out the research, I was attempting to synthesise my own previous biographical experience with my current reading in the area of phenomenology and critical theory, and my perceptions of what was taking place in the course sections which were the subject of my empirical investigations.

My formulation of the Emancipatory Code was a synthesis of all these influences and did not really come together until late May 1975. This meant that the data collected for the thesis was not the result of a clearly worked out empirical test of previously formulated theoretical positions; but was rather an attempt to capture, in any way possible, current perceptions of the existential situation. The data so collected was then reflected upon in the light of the developed theoretical framework.

This clearly presents great problems methodologically, because many of the questions which should have been asked in the light of the theoretical framework I had developed were not asked, and some of the questions asked were superfluous. Added to this there is the additional possibility of distorting the data to fit the later theoretical formulations. All I can say here is that I have been aware of this problem and have, to the best of my ability, attempted to avoid it; while there is an equal, if not greater, danger of fitting perceptions to a prior theoretical formulation; and so ignoring what may be very important qualifying factors in the empirical situation. In this sense then I am suggesting that, the blinkering of perceptions to fit previous theoretical frameworks, within which the researcher works may well seriously hinder his ability to perceive the total empirical situation in all its complexities.

At the same time it is clear that the type of empirical investigation I tried to carry out was not possible satisfactorily, given the nature of the empirical situation.

To obtain a comprehensive understanding of the interactional process in the classroom situation it was necessary to become an accepted "insider" of each section in terms of both the students and the instructor. This was clearly not possible, given the fact that I had three sections which I was attempting to observe, who held their classes at the same time. For both instructors and students my activities tended to be regarded as peripheral to the main purposes and interests of the class.

However I should point out that, given the different, and increasingly divergent philosophical positions of myself and the instructors, my role would have been, probably, closer to that of an analytical observer rather than an "action researcher" in the sense intended originally by the professor. It is, I think, unlikely that I would have been able to carry out the praxiological role of the committed Marxist researcher, who does not merely observe the reality of which he is a part, but actually attempts to change it.[29] This is of course, not merely due to the philosophical differences between the instructors nd myself as such; but is also a result of the fact that they worked within, for the most part, Integrated Code forms where their definitions of the educational situation could not be legitimately challenged by either me or the students.

Despite the fact that I had an enormous amount of data to draw upon; including over fifteen hours of tape-recorded interviews with students, and a similar number of hours of tape-recorded interviews with the professor and instructors, over a hundred bibliographical and evaluation questionnaires, notes from my own class observations, and tape-recordings and notes of group meetings between the instructors and the professor prior to the beginning of the course; there were still serious inadequacies in the data.

Clearly, I should have interviewed the instructors each week from the beginning of the course, since, in the first month, the instructors had to make the important transition from their conceptualisations of what they might do, and their perceptions of what was possible in the light of their early classroom experiences. The interview which I carried out at the end of the first month only threw limited light on this very important aspect of the developing pedagogical situation. Likewise the selection of only eight students from each section was a dangerously small sample from which to generalise about student perceptions of the whole course; although I tried, where possible, to combine the evidence from these interviews with other sources.

Although the questionnaires had the advantage of providing responses from a significantly large proportion of the students in each section, the quality of these responses on anything but the crudest factual information, such as age, sex, etc. was doubtful, since their validity relied upon understandings which I was never able to demonstrate existed. While a pilot run might have been of some use in this respect, there is, in my mind, an always unknown gap between the respondents' interpretation of the questionnaire question and the meaning which the researcher attached to the question which, when replicated in the answer, raises serious questions about the meaning of the respondent's answer. In this respect I am far from convinced that the quantity of data obtained in this manner can compensate for its doubtful quality.

In the interviews that I conducted there were also questions which were not followed up and meanings which were not clarified; so that there were often areas of doubt and uncertainty in my mind on re-listening to the tape-recordings, which, with more skilful interviewing techniques, would not have existed.

In short, it would be fair to say that the attempt to combine theory and practice, and to combine the methodologies of survey research and participant observation, was, at best, only a partial success.

The decision to treat the university situation, within which this investigation took place, as an ideal typification of a North American course-based Collection Code was an oversimplification, and to some extent a distortion of existential realities, existing within the structural framework which is course based, that draw upon traditions in both the European discipline orientated and the North American course based forms of the Collection Code. Likewise the continuing conflict within the Faculty of Education, which was revealed in the attitudes of instructors one and two, between the concept of education as a "respectable" academic discipline and the concept of education as professional training for intending teachers, and which still exists within the Educational Foundations Department itself to some extent, was not touched upon. In other words the full complexities of the university situation within which this investigation took place, even in terms of my own theoretical frameworks, were never fully revealed. While these were not crucial factors in terms of the work I carried out, they clearly need to be taken account of, in a manner which they were not in this thesis, to provide a comprehensive picture of the university situation, of which the course that was the subject of this research was a part.

Some of the faults which I have mentioned above could have been rectified by greater attention to detail and a more effective linking of theory and methodology. However there would still remain weaknesses in the methodology which are intrinsic to the nature of the thesis.

In attempting to develop a new theoretical perspective and use it to analyse an empirical situation I took on a task which was too great in size. I was aware of this almost from the beginning of the research and yet found it very difficult to reduce the scope of the investigation, since each area was contributing to my understanding of the whole situation. Thus, while in retrospect I feel that I should have concentrated upon developing the theoretical perspective, and carried out an empirical investigation at a later date, I am well aware that the empirical investigation influenced and became an integral part of the theoretical perspective, which would have been much the poorer without it.

Perhaps, ultimately the only answer to this dilemma is the synthesis of the currently separate roles of the researcher and the subject in a methodology of reflexive praxis, where each individual in any social situation contributes both to his own unique biographical development and to the social group, the society and the species kind of which he is a member.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Alan Dawe, "The Two Sociologies" in British Journal of Sociology Volume 21 1970 pp.207-18.

[2] Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan Penguin 1962.

[3] As explicated in Basil Bernstein, "On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge" in Knowledge and Control ed. by M.F.D.Young, Collier-MacMillan 1971 pp.47-69.

[4] See above, Chapter V.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Between November 15th and 27th 1974.

[7] Although the names of the graduate students who were to work with each professor were, for the 1974-75 academic year known by May 1974, it is not normally practicable for these instructors to meet with their professors until the beginning of September.

[8] Amongst these writers perhaps the best known are Habermas and Marcuse.

[9] See above, Chapter IV.

[10] Alvin W.Gouldner, The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology Avon Books 1971.

[11] Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd. 1937.

[12] E.V.Stonequist, The Marginal Man Russell and Russell 1961.

[13] Jurgen J.Habermas, Toward a Rational Society Beacon Press 1970 pp.6-9.

[14] Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed Seabury Press 1970.

[15] Louis Althusser, "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses - Notes Towards an Investigation" in Louis Althusser, Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays New Left Books 1971 pp.123-73.
Althusser used the phrase "regional ideologies" to refer, in particular to differing ideological positions amongst the ruling and the agents of social control e.g. the state welfare service and the state police. However in a country with the strong particularist tendencies of Canada I think it can also be use to refer to differing ideological

positions amongst ruling elites in different geographical provinces.

[16] I would like to acknowledge my thanks to Ian Taylor for this suggestion made in conversation during his visit to the University of Alberta September 1st to 5th 1975.

[17] Althusser, op. cit.

[18] In unit three of his course c/f Chapter VI.

[19] Bernstein, op. cit. p. 53.

[20] My own observations and conversations with students who have attended this university, and others in North America; combined with the diversity of background which the students brought to this course (explicated during interviews) led me to this conclusion.

[21] See Appendix I.

[22] Bernstein, op. cit.

[23] Geoffrey M.Esland, "Teaching and Learning as the Organization of Knowledge" in Young op. cit.

[24] As explicated in Chapter VII.

[25] As explained by students during interviews conducted at the end of the course.

[26] Patricia J.W.Daine, Educational Knowledge Codes: An Analysis of the Bernstein Typology M.Ed. Thesis University of Alberta 1973.

[27] Karl Marx, and Friedrich Engels, "The Holy Family: A Critique of Critical Criticism" in The Marx-Engels Reader ed. by R.C.Tucker, W.W.Norton and Co. Inc. 1972 p. 104.

POSTSCRIPT

There are two points which should be made about this thesis. One concerns style and the other concerns the implementation of Emancipatory Codes.

In writing this thesis I have used the first person singular to refer to my own thoughts, analyses and conclusions; a practice which, in the convention of formal presentations, is, at best, considered eccentric. However I have not done this without reason. I find the use of the term "the writer", and writing in the third person singular, suggests a false sense of detachment and "value-free" objectivity which I believe is untrue, as I have indicated in the text. Added to this, I find that writing in the third person increases the complexity of my style of writing. The other alternative, of using the first person plural, I find pretentious in the extreme. I have always associated the use of the first person plural, "we", with reigning monarchs, where it has referred to the twin supports of royal power, the temporal and spiritual, State and Church. Since I am neither monarch nor a religious believer, merely a man, I can conceive of no right I might have to use "we" instead of "I". These, in brief, are the two reasons why I have opted for the unconventional use of the first person singular to express my own opinions and interpretations throughout this thesis.

With respect to the implementation of Emancipatory

Codes; I have, concerning the empirical situation I have investigated, appeared, perhaps, very pessimistic. However, this is not intended to be an implicit suggestion that the professor, who is one of the subjects of this thesis, or anyone else, should not attempt, and continue to try, to introduce such an educational perspective. Far from it, for, only through the continual struggle against the social forms of life and technological monstrosities which dominant elites utilise in the mystification of the world of ordinary men, will such men become able to transcend the society, of which they are a part, to realise their true potential as creative, controlling and reflexive beings. This thesis is intended, therefore, however ineffectively, to point the way to a more effective pursuit of Emancipatory Code forms of education, not to the impossibility of such a task.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays.* New Left Books, 1971.

Ansubel, David P. *Learning Theory and Classroom Practice.* Toronto: OISE Bulletin Number 1 1967.

Avineri, Shlomo. *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx.* Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Banks, Olive. *The Sociology of Education.* London: Batsford, 1968.

Beard, Ruth. *Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.* London: Penguin, 1970.

Becker, Howard S. and Geer, Blanche. "Participant Observation: the Analysis of Qualitative Field Data". *Human Organization Research: Field Relations and Techniques.* Edited by Adams, Richard N. and Preiss, Jack J. Dorsey Press, 1960.

Becker, Howard S., Geer, Blanche and Hughes, Everett C. *Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

Bernstein, Basil. "On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge". *Knowledge and Control: New Directions in the Sociology of Education.* Edited by Young, Michael F.D. London: Collier-MacMillan, 1971.

Bernstein, Basil. *Class, Codes and Control* Volume I. Paladin Granada Publishing Ltd. First published Sondon: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971.

Cosin, B.R. *Education: Structure and Society.* London: Penguin, 1972.

Drietzel, Hans P. ed. *Recent Sociology Number Two.* New York: MacMillan, 1970.

Durkheim, Emile. *The Division of Labour in Society.* Translated by George Simpson. Free Press, 1964.

Esland, Geoffrey M. "Teaching and Learning as the Organization of Knowledge". *Knowledge and Control: New Directions in the Sociology of Education.* Edited by Young, Michael F.D. London: Collier-MacMillan, 1971.

Filmer, Paul, Phillipson, Michael, Silverman David, and Walsh, David. *New Directions in Sociological Theory.* London: Collier-MacMillan, 1972.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Translated by Myra B. Ramos. New York: The Seabury Press, 1970.

Giddens, Anthony. *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber* Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Gouldner, Alvin W. *The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology.* New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Habermas, Jurgen. *Knowledge and Human Interest.* Translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Habermas, Jurgen. *Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest, Science and Politics.* Translated by Jeremy Shapiro. Boston: Beacon Press, 1970.

Habermas, Jurgen. "Toward a Theory of Communicative Competence". *Recent Sociology Number Two.* Edited by Hans P. Drietzel. New York: MacMillan, 1970.

Hampden-Turner, Charles. *From Poverty to Dignity.* New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1975.

Hampden-Turner, Charles. *Radical Man.* New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., 1971.

Jackson, Philip W. *Life in the Classroom* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Josephson, Eric and Josephson, Mary. Editors. *Man Alone: Alienation in Modern Society.* New York: Laurel, Dell Publishing Co., 1962.

Joyce, Bruce and Weil, Marsha. *Models of Teaching.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall 1972.

Keddie, Nell. "Classroom Knowledge". *Knowledge and Control: New Directions in the Sociology of Knowledge.* Edited by Michael F.D. Young. London: Collier-MacMillan, 1971.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* 2nd. Ed.; Chicago The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Lukacs, Georg. *History and Class Consciousness.* Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1971.

McLeish, John. *Students' Attitudes and College Environments.* Cambridge Institute of Education, 1970.

Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge.* Translated by Louis Wirth and Edward Shils. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.,1936.

Mao-Tse-Tung. *Selected Readings from the Works of Mao-Tse-Tung.* Peking: Foreign Languages Press, 1971.

Marx, Karl. *Karl Marx: Early Writings.* Translated by T.B. Bottomore. McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. *The Marx-Engels Reader.* Edited by Robert C. Tucker. W.W. Norton and Co., 1972.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception.* Translated by Colin Smith. New York: Humanities Press, 1962.

Mills, C. Wright. *The Sociological Imagination.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Mills, C. Wright. *White Collar.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.

Morrison, Arnold and McIntyre, Donald. *Teachers and Teaching* London: Penguin, 1973.

Nowlis, Vincent; Clark, Kenneth E. and Rock, M. *The Graduate Student as Teacher.* Washington D.C. American Council on Education, 1968.

Open University Course Unit Five. (Educational Studies E283). Open University Press, 1972.

Psathas, Georg, ed. *Phenomenological Sociology: Issues and Applications.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Rex, John. *Sociology and the Demystification of the Modern World.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1974.

Rogers, Carl R. *Freedom to Learn.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing co., 1969.

Rostow, Walter W. *The Process of Economic Growth.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1952.

Scheffler, Israel. *Conditions of Knowledge: An Introduction to Epistemology and Education.* U.S.A.: Scott, Foreman and Co., 1965.

School and Society: A Sociological Reader. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1971.

Schutz, Alfred. On Phenomenology and Social Relations. Edited by Helmut R. Wagner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Schutz, Alfred. Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Reality. Ed. by Maurice Natanson. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1962.

Schwab, Joseph J., ed. The Biology Teachers' Handbook. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

Simon, Brian. Intelligence, Psychology and Education - A Marxist Critique. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.

Skolnick, Arlene and Skolnick, Jerome H. eds. Intimacy, Family and Society. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1974.

Stonequist, E.V. The Marginal Man: A Study in Personality and Culture Conflict. New York: Scribner, 1937.

Swift, Donald F. ed. Basic Readings in the Sociology of Education London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

Taylor, Ian; Walton, Paul and Young, Jock.. The New Criminology: For a Social Theory of Deviance. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Thompson, Kenneth and Tunstall, Jeremy, eds. Sociological Perspectives. London: Penguin, 1971.

Young, Michael F.D., ed. Knowledge and Control: New Directions in the Sociology of Education. London: Collier-MacMillan, 1971.

Young, Michael F.D. "An Approach to the Study of Curricula as Socially Organized Knowledge". Knowledge and Control: New Directions in the Sociology of Education. London: Collier-MacMillan, 1971.

Ziman, John M. Public Knowledge: The Social Dimension of Science. Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Journal Articles

Apple, Michael W. "The Adequacy of Systems Management Procedures in Education". Journal of Educational Research Summer 1972.

Becker, Howard S. "Problems of Inference and Proof in

Participant Observation". American Sociological Review 23 December, 1958.

Dawe, Alan. "The Two Sociologies". British Journal of Sociology XXI 1970.

Deutscher, J. "Words and Deeds: Social Science and Social Policy". Social Problems 13, 1966.

Garbutt, David A. "The New Sociology of Education". Education for Teaching November 1972.

Greene, Maxine. "Curriculum and Consciousness". Teachers' Record Volume 73, Dec. 1971.

Maslow, Abraham H. "Some Educational Implications of the Humanistic Psychologies" Harvard Educational Review 38, 1968.

Seeley, John. "The 'Making' and 'Taking' of Problems". Social Problems XIV 1966.

Unpublished Material

Daine, Patricia J.W. Educational Knowledge Codes: An Analysis of the Bernsteinian Typology. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1973.

APPENDIX I

QUESTIONNAIRE

Through these questions I am trying to obtain a sociological profile of your group in terms of various aspects of your biographical situations.

Your answers will be used partly in my thesis work at this university and partly for a comparative study of the backgrounds of English and Albertan students intending to be teachers.

1. Which section are you in? ......

2. Sex female ...... male ......

3. How old are you?

17-20 ...... 21-25 ...... 26-30 ...... over 30 ......

4. What year of university are you in?

1 ...... 2 ...... 3 ...... 4 ......

5. What is your major? ....

6. a) Did you work full-time before coming to university?

Yes ..... No .....

b) If your answer to 6a is Yes give a brief description of your job(s).

7. Where were you born?

Town .... Province ....

Country ....

8. Where did you live for the first fifteen years of your life?

on a farm .... years

in a small community less than 10,000 .... years

in a community of 10-50,000 .... years in a community over 50,000 .... years

9. Where have you lived for the last ten years?

on a farm .... years

in a small community less

than 10,000 .... years

in a community of 10-50,000 .... years

in a community over 50,000 .... years

10. Where is your family home now? Town ....

Province ....

11. Where do you normally live during term time?

with your family ....

in an apartment/house with

friends ....

on your own ....

in a hall of residence ....

12. What position are you in your family? Be specific e.g.

2nd of 4 children - 2 younger brs. 1 older sister

13. Are you? married ...... single ......

14. a) Do you have any children? Yes ...... No ......

b) If your answer to 14a is Yes what ages are they?

15. a) Where was your mother born? Country ....

b) Where was your father born? Country ....

16. a) If your mother was born in Canada where was she born?

Town .... Province ....

17.a) If your mother was not born in Canada - how long has she been in Canada?

...... years

b) If your father was not born in Canada - how long has he been in Canada?

...... years

18. a) What is your father's current occupation (if alive,

....

if retired, write retired)

b) What is your mother's current occupation (if alive, count housewife as an occupation) ....

19. a) What was your father's occupation 10 years ago? (If you do not know say unknown) ....

b) What was your mother's occupation 10 years ago? (If you do not know say unknown) ....

If they are the same as in 18a and b, just put same.

20. What grade level education does your mother have?

Grade ....

21. What grade level education does your father have?

Grade ....

22. a) Did your mother go to University? Yes .... No ....

b) did your father go to University? Yes .... No ....

23. a) Has your mother ever been a teacher?

Yes .... No ....

b) Has your father ever been a teacher?

Yes .... No ....

24. Are any of your close family relations or friends, apart from your parents, teachers? Yes .... No ....

25. Which type of school do you want to teach in?

Elementary .... Junior High .... High School....

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ED. FDN. 201

Students in Sections C1, C2, C3

By providing answers to the questions asked here you will be providing information which will help us plan next year's Ed. Fdn. 201 courses.

1. Which sections are you in?

C1.... C2.... C3....

2. In 2-3 lines summarise what you had heard about Ed. Fdns. 201 before you began the course.

3. In 2-3 lines summarise what sort of things you would like an Ed. Fdn. 201 course to cover.

4. Why did you take this course?

5. What kind of teaching/learning situation do you find best for:

a) Making you think?

b) providing you with information?

Note: The answers to a) and b) may be, for you the same.

6. What teaching method was mainly used in this course?

7. Which teaching method or methods do you think would be best for this course?

8. Do you feel you have understood the objectives of this course as specified by the professor. Yes .... No .... Undecided ....

10.a) If the answer to 9 is Yes then, how well do you think you achieved the objectives laid down by your convener.

b) If the answer to 9 is No or Undecided then, from what you know about the course, what do you think the objectives of the course should be

11.What do you feel you have learnt from this course? Be as specific as possible.

12.Do you think you have picked up an orientation or understanding during this course which will influence what you might do as a teacher in the classroom situation?

Yes.... No.... Undecided....

13. a) If the answer to 12 is Yes then, in 2-3 lines summarise this orientation or understanding.

b) If the answer to 12 is No or Undecided in 2-3 lines summarise what you consider to be the most important attitudes of a "good" teacher.

14.How useful and interesting have you found the textbook, Skolnick and Skolnick?

15. a) How much say would you like in evaluating your own work?

None.... 25%.... 50%.... 75%.... 100%....

b) How much say would you like other students to have in evaluating your own work?

None.... 25%.... 50%.... 75%.... 100%....

c) How much say would you like your convenor to have in evaluating your own work?

None.... 25%.... 50%.... 75%.... 100%....

Note: The % for a, b, c, should add up to 100%

16.What sort of work requirements, for evaluation, would you recommend for this course?

17.Do you think the class size is too big?

Yes.... No.... Undecided....

18.If your answer to 17 is Yes how many students would you have liked in the class? ....

19.What improvements would you suggest for this course next year?

20.Which type of school do you want to teach in?

Pre-school.... Elementary.... Junior High....

High School.... Other (specify)....

21.Which subject area do you hope to major in e.g. early childhood, maths?

22.Have you found the work load for this course, compared to others you have taken

Average.... Less than Average.... More than Average....

Many thanks for your co-operation.